

seat in the saddle. Witness also states that he had frequently drunk with prisoner in his room.

What then, I ask, can be inferred from all this, except the fact that his sickness and the delirium attending it grew out of excessive drinking, for there is nothing in the evidence for the defense that furnishes us any other explanation of it.

The deposition of George Urghart has been read and although a physician occupying the same room with defendant from February to July, 1855, yet he makes no allusion whatever to his mind, but simply speaks of him as being affectionate to his parents, particularly so to his mother. The next deposition is that of Dr. Wm. H. Curran of Kentucky, in which he refers to an attack which he supposed to be epilepsy, but I will refer more particularly to this deposition when I reach that branch of the case. We have next the deposition of Robert W. Raisin, who married a relative of defendant. This witness has known defendant 25 or 26 years, and states that he always considered him a wild and eccentric youth up to manhood. Upon one occasion witness was in his carriage passing over a bridge in Maryland—defendant was at the opposite end of the bridge, and as he saw witness coming, he raised the draw of the bridge, which placed witness in great danger—witness thought it was one of his common freaks of mind, very mysterious. The balance of Mr. Raisin's testimony is confined to the subject of hereditary insanity in prisoner's family, which will be the subject of comment when I come to notice that part of Mr. Wright's argument. The most that can be made out of Mr. Raisin's deposition is that prisoner was a wild and eccentric youth, such as we meet with daily in our intercourse with the world.

Mr. D. Blocher's deposition is next introduced. He knew defendant in 1848 and 1849 in Cumberland, Md.—thinks he had the head of a man but the mind of a boy. This witness gives no reason for his opinion, and in that request is a little more shrewd than Mr. H. Miles Moore. If he intends by that expression to imply that he was naturally wanting in good sense, he differs from every other witness who has given evidence in the case.