

produce authorities to contradict that. A man may suffer from a minor form of epilepsy all his life. I can quote an instance. I dare say you have heard of lightning calculators. That is a minor form of epilepsy. The lightning calculator is, as a rule, epileptic. A man makes a rapid calculation and sums up four columns of figures at once—that is a minor form of epilepsy. He need not go on and have severe attacks. He may go on for a long time being a lightning calculator.

39. It is possible for *petit mal* to exist for a long time without developing into the major form?—Without developing into the grand form.

40. Dr. Beattie says that if he had had minor epilepsy in childhood the signs of it must be quite visible now: do you agree with that?—I would like to know what the visible signs of epilepsy are between the attacks.

41. You do not agree with that statement?—I cannot agree with it because I do not know what he means by it. What does he say the signs of epilepsy are? Does it leave its permanent imprint?

42. You do not agree with the statement?—No, except that a person suffering from the *petit mal* of epilepsy is usually a man of a high-strung nervous temperament, and you can often spot that in looking at a man, whether he is of a high-strung nervous temperament or not.

43. Is that form of minor epilepsy always dangerous?—Some minor forms of epilepsy are; in fact, with qualifications, you may say that any man with epileptic tendencies is dangerous, because you never know what form his epilepsy is going to take. You never know whether it will spread from one part of the brain to the other.

44. Did the police intimate to you that there was any necessity for you to make out a committal certificate to get Johnston out of the way?—No, certainly not.

45. Had you any object in getting Johnston out of the way?—No object, beyond the fear that he might do harm to himself and his wife and children.

46. You were a sympathizer with what were called the arbitrationists?—Yes.

47. It has been stated by Johnston that you subscribed £50 towards their funds: is that true?—No, I did not subscribe £50 towards their funds. I did subscribe, but I do not see why that concerns anybody at all.

48. It has been suggested that when the arbitrationists went to a meeting in the Miners' Hall you supplied some of them with whistles and told them that you would get there, meaning that if they blew the whistles you had a crowd outside and were prepared to rush the hall: is there any truth in that?—It is absolutely untrue; it is absolute imagination.

49. So far as this commitment is concerned you did it on observation and without any antecedent history at all?—I said that I attended him at the time and observed epilepsy. That is the only antecedent history I had.

50. Did you every try to get any antecedent history?—I got it then, at the time. I asked him about the shooting.

51. I am talking about family history?—Oh, no, I did not, beyond what he gave me himself. You do not put down a family history. You may mention it as a fact, but not as a fact indicating insanity. A man's father may be insane, but it does not necessarily follow that the son will be. Therefore you do not put it down as a fact absolutely indicating insanity; you must go on the data you have got, and not commit a man to an asylum on account of his family history. If I were treating the case the family history would be of more importance.

52. *Mr. Campbell.*] If a man is once an epileptic is it possible for him ever to recover?—Yes.

53. He can absolutely recover?—He can recover.

54. The same, I suppose, applies to *petit mal*—he can more easily recover?—No. I will tell you why. *Petit mal* is more often due to hereditary trouble, but the *grand mal* may be due to a distinct lesion of the brain. For instance, a man gets a blow on the head and gets a depressed fracture and develops epilepsy. By removing that depression the patient may recover: the cause of the irritation is removed.

55. You would be fairly positive that if a man had *petit mal* to-day, although it might not be positive to-morrow, still it would be there?—He would be liable to an attack.

56. There would be no possibility of its absolutely disappearing?—There is a possibility of its absolutely disappearing, but it is impossible to say whether it will or not.

57. You cannot really tell?—You cannot really tell.

58. When Johnston gave you the history of the shooting did you ask him about it or did he volunteer the information?—As far as I remember he had spoken to Sergeant Wohlmann about the shooting.

59. You heard of it from another source?—Yes, and he admitted it when I spoke to him about it.

60. *Mr. Brown.*] How long had you been attending him?—I think, about three weeks.

61. All your observations as to what his trouble was were confined to three weeks' knowledge of the case?—Confined to the time I was attending him and the time I saw him in the police-station.

62. How often during that time would you see him to discuss anything with him?—I want you to remember that at the time I was attending Johnston I was not attending him with a view to committing him to a mental hospital. I was attending him in the hope that he would pick up and recover his mental balance, which was just wavering. He was suffering from nervous breakdown, and we all know that a man who is suffering from nervous breakdown may at any time become insane. I was hoping that with treatment and rest he would get well, and really thought he had improved. I suppose I had not seen him for about a week till I saw him in the police-station.

63. Was his physical condition all right?—No; he was run down.