

dence is entitled to *no more* weight than any other body of men, when speaking of subjects which lie within the range of common observation and experience." So do the stars and much of the wonderful phenomena of nature "lie within the range of common observation and in many instances, experience also, but by parity of reasoning a respectful hearing should only be given to Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Lyell, Agassiz, and Tyndall." Such is law but can it be dignified by the name of being common sense?

The student of this field of nature must be put on a par with the *ignobile vulgus*. The fact is, there is more aberration of mind, than is "dreamed of in our philosophy." A good many kinds of it, which carry in every act responsibility, and consequently liability to adequate punishment, are classified to shield crime. Some jurists avoid this, but juries do not. The lawyers say, the prisoner is crazy. The judge splits hairs about it, and "muddles us so," quoth the foreman. "Not guilty, my lord." It is certain, that if justice is to be meted out, either we must have a new and restricted definition of this *brama*, or mental disease, or certain classes of it must include moral guilt. Reason may be blunted and warped, but not lost, and thus deceives the conscience, as to right and wrong. Herein I differ (as will be seen hereafter) from the expressed opinions of all the medical jurists I have read on the subject. Conscience is *only* a judge to hear the evidence reason presents, and pronounces a verdict according to such affirmations. If the evidence should be false, then conscience will give a wrong decision, and if followed, *might* involve moral guilt, consequently, to say, that we are in the path of rectitude and sanity if we follow the dictates of conscience, is a fatal error. It gives decisions according to the evidence, but cannot discriminate as to its credibility, that is the work of judgment, and it only. If this definition of the function of conscience be correct, then a proper sense of right and wrong includes rational and true cognition of the objects or subjects of contemplation. In other words, the logical powers must be deficient in unsoundness of mind, pure and simple. This is always perceived in the subjects of lunacy. The premises may be false, but taking them for granted, the conclusion may be right. Or, the syllogism may be correct in the major or minor premises, but the deduction erroneous. Such self-delusion is common, and indicates sound reasoning powers, but unsound judgment, which leads conscience