

resolution from the strictly legal side, Mr. Marler said that expert testimony must be accepted in court so long as the law remained in its present state. He would not contend that expert testimony was necessary in itself, but was compulsory by law. Mr. Marler distinguished between a legal and a moral crime, and quoted Henry Howard, to show that a prisoner shall not suffer death if insane at the exact moment when murder is committed, regardless of his previous or subsequent actions. He contended that in the present case, twelve comparatively ignorant men could not appreciate the testimony of the learned doctors. Mr. Marler did not consider the Gauthier trial as an exact parallel, but adduced the case to prove that medical testimony as to insanity had in at least one instance been accepted as warranty for mental unsoundness. Mr. Marler cited another trial, which he thought was an exact parallel of the present case, that of Hayvern. The prisoner was hanged, and upon subsequent examination his brain was found to be very far from that of the normal human being. Mr. Marler's peroration was also well received by the meeting.

Mr. Rowett, Arts '97, spoke second on the affirmative. In his speech Mr. Rowett exhibited much personal acquaintance with the facts of the murder, and added some local color to the details of the tragedy at Valleyfield. Mr. Rowett saw in the actions of Shortis peculiarities vastly different from those of his relations who had died in mad houses. He admitted that Shortis had shown many eccentricities, but if insane at all it was after notoriety. He saw in the tragedy of March 1st the culmination of the ambition of the convicted. The prisoner had often been called a fool at home, sometimes also at Valleyfield, but in the latter instance the charge was preferred by luckless rivals in love. Mr. Rowett maintained that the application of the word in its graver sense occurred only when a commission was trying to find evidences of insanity. In ending a very forcible speech, Mr. Rowett referred to the deportment of Shortis immediately subsequent to the murder, his apparently cool satisfaction at having attained notoriety, and his very rational desire of being shot on the spot by a friend rather than facing the rigor of the law.

Mr. Stewart, Law '97, was the second speaker on the negative. On taking the platform Mr. Stewart confessed that he was about to make his maiden speech. He hoped the meeting would be able to follow his arguments easily. Mr. Stewart pointed out three theories for determining insanity in a prisoner, and took as the basis of his argument the English standard of the ability to discriminate between right and wrong. The affirmative had called the prisoner a spoilt child, they should really have called him a

spoilt lunatic. He admitted that the Archbishop of Waterford had known the lad well. The speaker thought that in reality the Archbishop new him took well to discover the real insanity which lurked in his boyish pranks. He considered it only natural that when the fond mother asked for a letter of recommendation, reminding the good priest that "never did sun shine upon such a son as this son," that he should grant her request. Coming to the insanity as shown in the Valleyfield murder, he condemned the present system of juries in such cases. They were not only ignorant in regard to the matter before them, but they had taken upon themselves to over-ride the evidence of persons of the highest repute who held opinions contrary to their own. Mr. Stewart differed from his confrères regarding the silence of Dr. Villeneuve. He thought that in this feature of the trial Mr. Macmaster had shown the wisdom of the serpent. Mr. Macmaster knew well, said he, the ignorance of his jury, and acted upon his knowledge. No evidence that Dr. Villeneuve might give could add anything to their stubborn conviction that Shortis was sane. Mr. Stewart went on to prove that the mania of Shortis was purely homicidal in its nature, and that therefore the man might be of apparently sound mental capacity except when seized by the homicidal tendency.

The time limit was reached before the speaker had left this point.

Mr. Stewart also met with a good reception. He is to be congratulated on his maiden speech. Older members of the Society might well give an equal amount of pains to the preparation of their speeches.

Mr. Thomas, Arts '98, was the third speaker on the affirmative. He was left little choice in the subject matter of his speech. It only remained with him to show from the details of the crime that Shortis was quite sane on the 1st of March. It appears that Wilson, the assistant bookkeeper, had a pistol in his desk, and only gave it up to be cleaned after he had withdrawn the cartridges. Shortis was evidently unable to accomplish his purpose with an empty revolver. But when he had returned the weapon and it had been re-loaded, he did not hesitate to snatch it up as Wilson's back was turned, and fire upon the men now at his mercy. The subsequent details were certainly important though ghastly. That the crime was committed solely for the money then in the mill seemed clear to Mr. Thomas, from the fact that only when it was being removed beyond his reach was Shortis incited to the idea of murder. In conclusion, Mr. Thomas alleged that Dr. Villeneuve had not been called on the stand because the jury-men were too ignorant to follow such evidence as he would have given.