

is one thing and the diseases to which drunkenness leads are different things and if a man by drunkenness brings on a state of diseases which caused such a degree of madness, even for a time, ~~which~~<sup>if</sup> would have relieved him from responsibility. If it had been caused in any other way, then he would not be criminally responsible.

In my opinion in such a case the man is a madman and is to be treated as such, although his madness is only temporary. If you think he was so insane<sup>and</sup> that if his insanity had been produced<sup>by</sup> other causes he would not be responsible for his actions, then the mere fact that it was caused by drunkenness will not prevent it having the effect which otherwise it would have of excusing him from punishment.

Drunkenness is no excuse but delirium tremens caused by drunkenness may be an excuse, if you think it produces such a state of mind as would otherwise relieve him from responsibility.

If you think there was a distinct disease caused by drunkenness but differing from drunkenness, and that by reason thereof, he did not know that the act was wrong, you will find a verdict of not guilty on the ground of insanity, but, if you are not satisfied with that, you must find him guilty either of stabbing with intent to murder or to do grievous bodily harm.

The Jury returned a verdict of not guilty on the ground of insanity.