

and in this year of grace 1873, who "without fee, or hope of reward" conscientiously believe, and could give reasons, weighty and potent in theory, that a number of *e.g.*, our public men are afflicted with monomania, and hence *latefully* irresponsible creatures, objects of pity. This state is easily simulated. A few months ago, a clever reporter of the New York *Tribune* feigned insanity. He went to a hotel—called for 'hippopotamus soup'—wanted to take the first express train to the moon—had a notion that suicide would be pleasant by jumping out of a third story window—frightened a medical student, who was sent to watch him and note symptoms and signs, nearly out of his senses—made a stout Hibernian servant cry fire, to awaken at midnight the hundreds of lodgers in the hotel for fear of his life—stuffed the pillow in his mouth to prevent himself from laughing, was thought to be in a paroxysm of rage—was patted on the head by fair hands, and soothed to quietude by soft words. He got his pulse up to 140 by indulging in bursts of fury, and deceived two clever physicians, and one "stupid," all of whom made affidavits that he was insane. The Dr of Bloomingdale Asylum noted him as a dangerous character, and put him among yelling maniacs for days, yet all was "a delusion and a snare." Had this man contemplated and executed murder, immediately before, or during this time, using this madness as a cloak, these medical gentlemen could have given evidence as to his insanity, sufficiently strong to clear him. This matter has become serious, and among our neighbours a plague spot in jurisprudence. Mrs. Fair shoots her paramour through jealousy, and is proved to have been impelled by insane impulse. Stokes puts a bullet through Fisk from blind hate, and the same plea is urged. Richardson is shot in the N. Y. *Tribune* office, by a maddened and divorced husband, and the insane defence frees him from a just retribution. Dozens of such instances might be cited. One hundred and ten murderers and manslayers have been imprisoned in New York during the last eighteen months, and of these, 40 per cent have entered, or are entering a plea of *non compos mentis*. How can medical evidence rebut such an argument, or arrive at a solution of the complex problem, seeing that human skill and experience know so little of its secret workings? The law virtually puts doctors on a par with any other observers, and ironically says in substance "while great respect should be paid to experts, their evi-