

therefore, that when all hope was over, and a clever lawyer had played his last card, the wretched criminal, a deplorable disgrace to our profession, should have not only confessed the crime of which he had, appealing solemnly to Heaven, declared when sentence was pronounced that he was innocent, but acknowledged that he merited the punishment which he was about to undergo. The Home Secretary in this case, as in that of Lefroy, acted in a manner which has commended itself not only to the judgment of mental physicians, but the common-sense of mankind.

---

*Case of Maclean.*

The case of Roderick Maclean has given rise to no psychological immoralities, because it was one upon which neither self-interest nor love of notoriety could hope to gain a hearing. The indications of mental disease were from the first transparently clear. Letters written so far back as May, 1880, showed the disordered state of his mind at that time. They are worthy of preservation in this Journal, and will be found with other matter in "Notes and News."

The motives he assigned for shooting at the Queen are probably true, and if so, it is clear that he was not acting under any homicidal impulse pure and simple. The day after the attempt he wrote thus:—"I am not guilty of the charge of shooting with the intention of causing actual bodily harm. My object was, by frightening her Majesty the Queen, to alarm the public, with the result of having my grievances respected, viz., such as the pecuniary straits in which I have been situated." His grievances are referred to in the same way in another letter written on the day of the attempted assassination. "I should not have done this crime had you, as you should have done, allowed the 10s. per week, instead of offering the insultingly small sum of 6s. per week, and expecting me to live on it." His delusions of persecution, combined with some mental weakness, amply accounted for the act he committed without reference to any homicidal impulse. He is one of the class of dangerous lunatics at large who ought in some way to be under supervision—that element of danger in our midst to which the Earl of Shaftesbury referred in such strong terms in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1877.