

19638-61

The King
versus
Bellingham
15th May 1812
Summing up

John

Lord

In

at

with

Pe

in

In

wa

In

The King
versus
John Bellingham

Copy from W. Gurney's
short hand notes of the
summing up on the
Trial of this Indictment
at the Sessions House
in the Old Bailey before
the Right Hon^{ble} Lord C.J.
Mansfield The Hon^{ble} W.
Justice Grose & The Hon^{ble}
Mr. Baron Graham 15th
May 1812

Summing up
Lord Chief Justice Mansfield

Gentlemen of the Jury
You are now trying an
Indictment against the Prisoner
at the Bar charging him with the
wilful murder of Mr. Spencer
Percival and the murder of him
in the manner charged in the
Indictment with a pistol loaded
with a bullet of which as the
Indictment states he Mr. Percival
died

died - when I mention the name
 revered and honored by every English
 -man of Mr. Spencer Percival I
 find it extremely difficult to suppress
 my own emotions but I forbear to
 say any thing of the distinguished
 talents and virtues of that amiable
 and eminent man because I should
 be unwilling to excite any un-
 pleasant emotion in the minds of
 those who hear me and because
 certainly in the judgment which
 you are to give upon the evidence
 before you it would not be pro-
 per that you should be influenced
 by any considerations of merit
 or excellence in the man who
 has been murdered but you are
 to try the Indictment against
 the Prisoner at the Bar upon
 the evidence which has been
 given to you as you would that
 for

for the murder of any other Englishman. The law protects the lives of all that are subject to it with equal care and the crime in the judgment of the law is the same whether it is the murder of the first and highest person in the Country or that of the lowest and meanest individual and the only question you now have to try is whether this man did wilfully and in the judgment of the law maliciously murder Mr. Percival.

It is not necessary for me to go very minutely into the evidence of the facts which have been proved to you by the several witnesses who have been examined because as to many of them there cannot be any doubt in your minds - The first thing to be proved

19

proved upon an Indictment for murder is that the person who is charged to have been murdered was so murdered. The first question therefore you have to consider is whether Mr. Percival as charged by the Indictment was murdered by the shot of a pistol - With respect to that you have the evidence first of Mr. Smith who was in the lobby of the House of Commons at the time when this fatal event happened and he states that he heard the report of a pistol - it appeared to come from the entrance of the lobby near the door of it near that door at which persons enter who are coming into the lobby - there was a crowd about it and a person seemed to escape in a manner from the crowd whom he

he did not then know - he was talking to a gentleman at the same time but on hearing the noise and turning his head and seeing this person coming forward he observed that the person very soon staggered though he had no idea at the time of his being a wounded man but he rather appeared to be a man coming out of the crowd to shelter himself but very soon he observed him reel - he reeled by him staggered and then fell upon his face - he tells you that he expected he would rise again not conceiving him then to be fatally wounded but seeing that he remained still and without any effort to rise he and another gentleman lifted him up and when they had lifted him up and had had an opportunity of seeing his face he

he perceived it was Mr. Percival -
he and that Gentleman who was
with him and others then carried
him into the room which was
called the Secretary of the Speaker's
Room and there put him upon
tables and Chairs - they then perceived
that he was wounded by some
small mark of blood and it
appeared that he was just dying
and very shortly was dead - he
heard him make or attempt to
make some exclamation before he
was removed into the Secretary's
room very indistinctly but it
appeared to him as if he was ut-
tering the word murder or some
thing like it - He tells you like-
wise that he sat there till Mr.
Lynn the Surgeon came

My Lynn gives you an
account of the wound he gives
the same description as Mr. Smith
had

had given of the situation of it that it was near the nipple of the left breast and Mr. Lynn describes it as the wound of rather a large pistol ball the ball appearing to have sloped downwards according to Mr. Lynn's opinion had very seriously wounded the heart and when Mr. Lynn examined it all pulsation had ceased and he was perfectly dead - he says he has no doubt the cause of the death was the wound he had received from the ball therefore thus far there seems to be no doubt you probably can have no doubt that Mr. Percival died from the pistol shot but neither of these gentlemen gave you an account of what happened particularly with respect to the person by whom that wound was given.

The next witness called was Mr. Burgess and he tells you that he

196

he was in the lobby upon last Monday about five o'clock - that he heard the report of a pistol - that it proceeded from the entrance of the lobby he saw a person coming from the entrance towards the House staggering just before he came to the pillar near the door of the lobby and that he very soon put his hand upon his breast and felt and he heard the articulation of "Oh" or something like it the person then fell upon his face and he heard some one say "that is the man or that is the person" meaning the person who had fired the pistol and he saw a hand pointing towards the bench by the fire on the side of the lobby - he immediately went to the bench pointed at and saw the prisoner sitting on the bench in great agitation - there

There were one or two persons near him - he immediately lifted the hand of the man and saw his left hand on the bench and near or under the handle of a pistol - he immediately took the pistol into his possession and then he asked the man who is the prisoner at the bar what could induce him to do such an act. The prisoner replied it was his want of redress of grievances and refusal by Government or to that effect this the prisoner assigned as the reason for firing the pistol without giving any other reason for it - without denying it at all and indeed by giving that reason for doing it admitting that he had done it - Then Mr. Burgess tells you that he said to him "you have another pistol in your pocket" The prisoner replied "yes" - He asked him if it was loaded - he said "yes" he put his hands within his coat and

and took another pistol from his coat pocket or his breeches pocket. Then Mr. Burgess tells you that the first pistol which he took from his hand was warm - the pan was down and it had the appearance of having been recently discharged - the warmth of the pistol and the pan being down and other appearances of the pistol would shew whether it had been recently discharged and Mr. Burgess tells you it appeared to have been recently discharged he immediately put his hand into the Prisoner's right hand waistcoat pocket and took out a small pen knife and a pencil and out of his left pocket he took some other things - he saw another pistol taken from him and a bundle of papers - the prisoner was then detained in custody and taken up stairs to be examined before the Magistrate. He (the witness) says that he stated before the Magistrate the facts he has stated here. The Prisoner said as nearly as he (Mr. Burgess) could recollect Mr. Burgess is correct in his statement in every part except one - but I believe he is correct in all other parts instead of my hand being as Mr. Burgess has stated upon or near the pistol. I think he took it from my hand or out of my hand a very slight difference which

which is mentioned by Mr. Burgess to show
 the Prisoner was very attentive to his ex-
 -amination and to what he stated and
 attending to it admitted it to be correct
 except in that trifling difference as to
 whether the pistol was in his hand or
 near to it Mr. Burgess thinking his hand
 was upon the pistol or near it only show-
 -ing that the Prisoner was attentive to
 the examination of Mr. Burgess - He
 was asked whether he heard an order
 to shut the door - he says he did but
 that is immaterial for it is proved
 by the other Witnesses that an order
 was immediately given to shut the
 door that no person might escape
 out of the lobby till it was ascertained
 who was the person who had fired
 the pistol - he says that at the time
 when the prisoner was upon this bench
 and when he (Mr. Burgess) went to
 him in this way he appeared to be
 much agitated but that when he was
 up stairs he was perfectly calm and
 cool - he tells you that there are
 generally persons stationed at the bottom
 of the five or six steps that lead
 from the lobby and which any person
 going

going from the lobby must go down
and that any persons going from the
lobby must necessarily go near
those persons.

The next Witness is General
Gascoigne and he tells you that he
was going into the House of Commons
for the purpose of presenting a Petition
which he wished to shew to Mr. Percival
who had not then come - that he
then went to a Committee Room up
stairs - that that Committee Room is
near the balustrades from which he
could look into the lobby and the
door being open he could hear the
sound of the pistol in the Committee
Room as well as if he was in the
lobby - he heard a loud report of a
pistol shot and he immediately
rushed down through the House into
the lobby the door facing the balustrades
was open all the time
but he went through the House
into the lobby "The moment I came
into the lobby" he says "I saw a crowd
collected round an individual whom
I could not see a person near me whom
I

I should not now know said,
 "that is the person who fired
 the pistol, pointing to John
 Bellingham the prisoner".
 The prisoner was a person
 whom General Gascoigne well
 knew, and he was then sitting
 on the bench near the fire
 place of the Lobby between
 the fire place and the en-
 -trance of the Lobby. He imme-
 -diately seized him by the
 breast, and as he lifted up
 his hand it appeared to him
 that he had a pistol in it
 which was cocked. The first
 impression upon his mind
 was that he meant to use it
 against himself. He therefore
 kept down his arm with
 all the strength he could, and
 another person who appears
 to have been the last witness
 Mr. Burgess took the pistol
 from the Prisoner's hand, and
 the Prisoner appeared to make
 very

very little resistance. You heard what Mr. Burge's said about his having another pistol, and General Gascoigne says that he had. He says that he proceeded to search him and he put his hand into his coat pocket and took out a bundle of papers tied with red tape which he gave to Mr. Hume. The pressure was very great, and the Prisoner was close to him, and he was fearful of losing the Prisoner and the papers, and therefore he held them up as high as he could that Mr. Hume or some other person might take them, and Mr. Hume held out his hand and took them. That it appeared to him that the Prisoner was dragged as it were from his hold, and he has no doubt it was by other persons endeavoring to secure him, although it was at the time

time equivocal whether it was
 an attempt to get the Prisoner
 out of his grasp or not. He
 says however afterwards that
 he believes it was the mere
 effect of the crowd pressing
 all round, he having his hand
 upon the Prisoner, having
 held him from the time he
 took hold of him, and he then
 told the Prisoner he could not
 escape. that he knew him well,
 and he would not lose sight
 of him, upon which the Prisoner
 said he had submitted, and
 he rather complained of General
 Gascoigne pressing him too much.
 he said he had submitted,
 and that he was the person
 who had fired the shot. so
 that he then admitted the
 fact, and he gave a reason
 for what he had done. With
 the assistance of others he was
 dragged into the body of the
 House and placed at the Bar

Bar in the custody of a Messenger belonging to the House. General Gascoigne says he never lost sight of him till he was taken up stairs and examined. The Prisoner when General Gascoigne gave his evidence said he was too accurate for him to question what he had said. he must have been less agitated than he himself was. General Gascoigne says at first he appeared agitated, but that afterwards when examined he appeared to have recovered when his examination was taking, and he spoke with the same composure as he used to do when he had known him (he himself being Representative for Liverpool) that he was composed as he usually was and spoke in the same manner as he usually did. he had seen him I think about the latter end of April and had conversed with him for a considerable time. He tells you that the Prisoner called at his house the day before

before and left his name with the servant. that he was then not at home, and the Prisoner had left word he would call the next day, when General Gascoigne ordered the servants to admit him, which they did, and he saw him.

The next witness produced before you is Norris. he gives an account of his having seen the Prisoner about the House of Commons. He states that he has frequent occasion to attend the gallery for strangers in the House of Commons. that he came down for that purpose last Monday. that in passing to the staircase he went near the Lobby. that he arrived about five o'clock or ten minutes past five at the utmost. he observed the Prisoner near the outer door in the Lobby, near that part of the door entering the Lobby which is generally closed. the door he says is a double door. Mr Burgess told you that the man

man was in the lobby, so
 that as described by Mr. Burgess
 and by Morris the Prisoner
 had stationed himself just
 within that part of the door
 of the lobby, it being a double
 door, which was generally
 shut, the other part of the door
 being open, through which
 persons having occasion to
 come into the lobby of course
 ordinarily come - He tells you
 that the Members and others
 who come in come in, as of
 course they must, at that side
 of the door which is usually
 open - the place where the pri-
 soner stood was so near to
 that part of the door which is
 usually open as to be I think
 within an arms length of any
 person passing in as they came
 into the lobby, and he had the
 appearance to Morris of a per-
 son stationed there watching
 for somebody coming in, and
 he appeared to him according
 to

to his recollection to be anxiously watching, and he thinks with his right hand in his breast near his left side, under his coat. He says almost immediately after he had got to the top of the Gallery stairs, that is about twenty stairs up, he heard the report of a pistol and he heard a noise as if there was great confusion in the Lobby and somebody said that Mr. Perceval was killed. He was asked whether he was certain that the Prisoner was the man whom he saw stationed just within that part of the door, and he says that he is perfectly certain that the Prisoner was the person he saw, and that he had frequently seen him before in the Strangers Gallery and about the passages of the House. That Gallery is the Gallery where persons reporting proceedings of Parliament and those who come to hear debates are allowed to be. I think either Norris or Mr. Smith proved that the time when Mr. Perceval usually came

came to the House was just about five o'clock, either a little before or a little after - and General Gascoigne tells you that he went himself to the House expecting to see him at that time.

The next witness is a person of the name of Vickery - he is a Bow Street Officer - he went to the lodgings of the Prisoner and took some papers and likewise the pistol bags a mould and some bullets - on comparing that key with the pistols that the Prisoner had it fits them, so that it must have been the key belonging to those pistols. the balls in the room were balls of the same size, and there was a mould which was a mould for making pistol balls of a size fit for those pistols. I

I omitted to state to you the evidence of Taylor who is a tailor himself and who was employed to make for this man some clothes, a coat and pantaloons. After he had made them he saw him again - he met him not a great way from Millman Street, and the Prisoner asked him to go back to his house for he had another job for him to do - he went to his house and he there showed him the job - that it was to do something to a coat - the Prisoner went up and brought down the coat ^{and} a piece of paper by way of directions for the side pocket to be made within that part of the coat which covers the breast and I think he said the left side of the coat - the coat was afterwards produced which he thus attended for him - he saw him at another time when he told him he had another job for him to do

The next Witness is Dowling - he tells you that he was in the Gallies

of the House of Commons on Monday
last. he heard a pisttol discharged and
he immediately rushed into the Lobby - he
saw the Prisoner at the Bar there and
took from the pocket of his small-clothes
upon the left hand a small pisttol which
he produced. that he examined it imme-
diately afterwards and it was loaded
with powder and ball and the ball is
now in it - it was also primed as well
as loaded. he says the ball will
equally fit the one pisttol as the other
- the pisttols he says are fellows exactly
alike. he had seen the Prisoner several
times before in the Gallery of the House
of Commons and in the avenues lead-
ing to it - he saw him a week or
six days before last Monday he was
very frequently in the Gallery during
the Debates and he sat immediately
next to the Prisoner, on some particu-
lar evening when business was going
on in the House - he was near him
half an hour - and they entered into
conversation together

The

The next Witness is Mr Newman. he produces the coat merely to identify it to show that the Prisoner had that same coat upon him which had been altered by Taylor Beaumont was then examined to prove that that was the coat of the Prisoner and that there was some rip in it which the Prisoner said was occasioned by the scuffle in the crowd and it was repaired by some person in the prison

This gentlemen is the evidence on the part of the Prosecution and the facts to be made out in order to support this Indictment to which you have peculiarly to attend are these. First it must be proved that Mr Perceval died of the wound of this pistol and that the Prisoner was the person who fired the pistol and with respect to these two ^{important} points you have the evidence I have stated to you the situation where the Prisoner was his having the pistol in his hand when Mr Burgess first took it from him with the pan down as if it had been recently fired. you have his own admission to Mr Burgess who asked him how he could do this act that he said it

196

it was for the refusal of Government
to redress his grievances that he did the act
and there are the circumstances I have
stated to you - you have the evidence with
with respect to the deliberation with which
this act was committed - you have the
preparation of the pistols at his lodgings.
you have the evidence of persons who
have frequently seen him in the gallery
and in the avenues. you have the evi-
dence of the particular station in which
he placed himself just within that door
of the Lobby which gave him a full
opportunity of assassinating any
man who entered at the open
part of the door if he had any
such wicked purpose in his mind
and I am very sorry that in the
very long Defence which he read
and spoke to you - there was no
denial of the fact. but as far
as I could collect not hearing
it

it so well as you could - though
 he stated a great deal of what
 he had done and what he had suf-
 -fered as a sort of Justification of
 what he had done he did not
 deny that he had done it but stated
 in so many words that a claim
 of Justice was his object and if I
 could collect any thing from
 what he stated to you and which
 you heard more perfectly than I
 could it seemed to amount
 to this that he had been hardly
 used when he went on business
 to Russia - that he was imprisoned
 there once or twice that he made
 great complaints to the Russian
 Government and to Lord Leveson
 Gower and to Sir Stephen Sharpe
 our Consul there and that he could
 obtain no redress - that afterwards
 when he came to this Country
 he applied to Mr Perceval, to the
 Lords

Lords of the Treasury and to other Members of Administration and got a Petition presented to the Prince of Wales and could not obtain any redress by any of these means still persuading himself as men are very apt to do that having sustained a loss in Russia and been imprisoned there he had had injustice done to him and persuading himself that he had a right to obtain redress somewhere or other in this Country for this injury which he complains of as suffered by him in Russia and then he seems to conclude that in point of justice he had a right to put M. Perreval to death because that redress he was endeavoring to obtain was refused him - a very dreadful mode of reasoning if a man who fancies he has a right endeavors to assert that right and finding he cannot succeed is to put to death the persons who refuse to give him that reparation which he

he supposes himself entitled to by
 the same rule every person who
 presides in every Court of Judicature
 in the Country might be put to
 death if he determined that a person
 suing before him either to recover
 land or damage for an injury was
 not entitled to that which he claimed
 Every Judge refusing to give what
 a Plaintiff in his action required
 might on the same ground be
 put to death as guilty of an act
 of injustice

In answer to this Case thus
 supported as I have stated to you
 on the part of the Prosecution
 you have a defence not made
 by the Prisoner but by some Wit-
 nesses who have been produced
 on the part of the Prisoner with
 a view of inducing you to believe
 that he is not an object of crimi-
 nal prosecution for the act
 which he committed because at
 the time when he committed
 that

that act he was insane. Witnesses have been
 examined for that purpose with respect to
 which the law is extremely clear if a
 man is insane is deprived of all power
 of reasoning so that he cannot distinguish
 right from wrong if he has no idea
 of the difference between the most wicked
 and the most innocent act then he is
 not an object of the law - such a man
 so destitute of all power of judgment
 cannot be said to have any wicked
 intention because he cannot be said
 to have any intention at all - but in
 order to support a defense of that sort
 it must be made out by very clear
 and distinct evidence that the man
 is so far void of all reason and all
 faculty that he is incapable of dis-
 tinguishing good from evil and in
 this case to support that defense it
 must be proved beyond all doubt that
 at the time he committed this act
 (if you are of opinion he did commit it)
 he did not know that murder was a
 crime against the law of God or of
 nature or against the law of this Country
 for no other sort of insanity or want of
 understanding will excuse a Criminal
 who

who is prosecuted for murder or for any other crime
 With respect to insanity there are various
 species of it - some men or some human
 creatures are void of all faculties from
 their birth - are perfect idiots - such
 persons never can be guilty within
 the judgment of the Law of any crime
 because they are incapable of distin-
 guishing good from evil, virtue from
 vice, right from wrong and being so
 void of all powers of judging the
 effect of their actions the law says
 whatever crimes they happen to
 commit they are not to be punished
 for it there are other species of madness
 some that are temporary generally
 denominated Lunary which affl-
 men at particular times and leave
 them possessed of a very rational degree
 of understanding if such persons
 commit crimes when the malady
 is upon them to that degree that they
 are incapable of distinguishing
 good from evil the law says they
 are to be excused but if they commit
 crimes when their disorder has
 diminished to such a degree that they
 are

are capable of distinguishing good from evil and of knowing the consequences of their actions then though they are occasionally totally deprived of reason or their reason is essentially diminished yet they are answerable for all the crimes committed during the time when they are possessed with a sufficient degree of reason and judgment to enable them to distinguish good from evil and the effect and consequences of their acts. There are other species of insanity where people take particular fancies into their heads who are perfectly sane and sound upon all other subjects but that is not a species of insanity which can excuse any person who has committed a crime because a particular whim or fancy may at times so affect his understanding as to make him differ from other persons in his judgment of ordinary subjects unless it so affects his mind at the particular period when he commits the crime as to disable him from distinguishing between good and evil or to judge of the con-

consequences of his actions such sort of insanity will be no excuse for him - Now here on the part of the prisoner Witnesses have been called to prove before you that he was insane - they have not described with any particularity what that insanity was but they have given you a very singular account of the Prisoner in order to show that he at the time of the commission of this crime was insane

The first Witness for the Prisoner in order to make out this which is called insanity, was a woman of the name of Billett and she tells you she has known the Prisoner a great while - that she had not seen him before this fatal event for a twelvemonth so that what has been his state of mind for a twelvemonth she is perfectly ignorant but she tells you that his father had a deranged mind and that she has known this man from childhood that

1965

that his mind was affected. I think since his return from Ruffia from which he returned about three years ago I think that it is her belief that he has been perfectly in a state of derangement three or four years and that that derangement is in respect of this business that is to say that some how or other he has conceived an imagination that he has been very much injured in Ruffia and that the Government of this country ought to make him a compensation and that for three or four years he has been deranged but as I observed to you she tells you in so many words explicitly that she has not seen him for a twelvemonth - Now what his state of mind was a twelvemonth ago is perfectly immaterial to your present enquiry the only question to be enquired into here with respect to his insanity being whether at the time when this act was committed

mitted he was possessed of a sufficient degree
 of understanding to distinguish good from
 evil right from wrong or if he was of a
 sufficient capacity to know that Murder was
 a crime and a crime not only against the
 law of God but the law of this Country for
 which he was subject to punishment - nothing
 short of that degree of insanity at the time
 when the fact was committed will afford him
 any excuse. The Account of him given by her
 during those three or four years is that he has
 constantly gone about his business like another
 man - that he came up to London once before
 I think upon this business - that he came up
 to London by himself so long ago as Christmas
 last and has been here ever since nobody
 taking care of him - nobody restraining him -
 no Medical assistance ever thought of to
 cure any malady under which his mind
 was supposed to labor his wife being at
 Lwer-

Liverpool and his friends or his acquaintance here for a man who has been so long in trade and who went to Russia on trade must have many - they all suffer this man to come to London - to transact business like other men and the account given by the papers he himself read to you is that he was here perpetually on business acting like other men - uncontrolled like other men - left entirely to the disposal of himself and his own person - going where he wanted doing what he would from whence you are to judge whether the conduct of his friends towards him and his own conduct left to himself transacting business like any other man who was in the possession of his reason is not much stronger proof than was necessary that he was possessed of that degree of understanding that enabled him to know that Murder was a crime for which he was liable to suffer

Another Witness Mrs Clark speaks

speaks to having seen him six or seven times
 since he came to London at Christmas last and
 she says she has known him several years but
 has known most of him since he returned from
 Rufia about two years and a half back she has
 been in company with him six or seven times
 and it is her opinion that ever since he
 came from Rufia he has been disordered
 in his mind - she had seen him once lately
 near Red Lion Square but only for ten min-
 utes and she did not see any thing particular
 in his conduct - This woman gives you only
 her simple opinion and that opinion arising from
 her having seen him six or seven times at the
 time when he was here in London doing busi-
 -ness for himself going to any person whom
 he wished to apply to - to the Secretary of State
 to the Lords of the Treasury and Members of
 Parliament at the time that General Gascoyne
 speaks of having conversed with him in a very
 composed manner - during all this time this
 woman

woman tells you that in her opinion he was deranged but that is all that her evidence amounts to and that only during six or seven interviews since his last coming to London he having come to London at Christmas last

The next witness is still more singular for that is a witness of the name of Higgins a servant to Mrs Roberts with whom the prisoner has lodged for four months and she says that on the Sunday before the Monday on which this transaction took place he appeared very confused - that is the account she gives of him that he appeared very confused and that she made that observation in her own mind - that on Monday she observed something particular - she thought him rather flurried and hurried - You will consider if he had had the soundest and strongest head of any man alive and had it in his mind to commit such a crime as is imputed to this man on that very Monday

Monday whether it would have been at all extraordinary if some agitation of mind had appeared - when men have dark and bloody designs brewing within their breasts nothing is more likely to excite hurry and confusion than the very conception of such a design and the suppression of it within their breast till the time of executing their wicked intentions shall come - but what is the account given of the conduct of cl^r Roberts and this Prisoner upon that very day - he first goes out with cl^r Roberts upon the Sunday to the Foundling Hospital in the morning - in the afternoon they were to have gone to another place of worship I think to the Magdalen but the rain preventing them they went again to the Foundling Hospital and according to the opinion of this Maid servant he was then in a state of confusion, he went to Church in the morning and again in the afternoon - nothing singular appeared in his conduct or behaviour, no one

act on that day is imputed to him
at all and on the next day the
Monday at one o'clock before the
Corrid Blood which is the subject
of your enquiry was perpetrated he
went out with Mrs Roberts and
her son to a place where some
spectacle was exhibiting I think the
Museum - You will judge whether
the evidence these persons give of the
manner in which this man did business
like all other men, the manner in which
he behaved and in which he was dis-
posed of on the Sunday and Monday
is not much stronger evidence than
would be necessary to prove that a
man committing the Corrid act with
which he was charged was possessed
of a sufficient degree of understanding
to know that the crime which he was
committing was an enormous crime
and such as subjected him to pu-
nishment in this world and the
next, and it is singular that neither
of these persons who both came here to
tell

tell you that in his opinion he was
 insane, mention any one eccentric
 act anything extraordinary done
 by him from which any person would
 reasonably judge that he was not
 as much possessed of his understanding
 as any man whatever. I have told
 you what I take to be the undoubted
 law upon this subject and you have
 had a case mentioned to you by
 the Attorney General when he first
 opened this case to you which was ^{very}
 very much stronger in favor of the
 Prisoner than the evidence here
 given for there a man of the name
 of Arnold prosecuted for maliciously
 shooting at Lord Onslow was proved
 to have been very frequently deranged
 but for the commission of the act he
 had made that preparation (buying
 a gun and large shot and small
 shot and other things) which showed
 an deliberate intention in his mind
 to commit the crime which he afterwards
 did that though he was clearly ^{proved}

proved to be a Lunatic - to be frequently disordered in his mind and many acts denoting a Lunatic were proved yet as there was evidence to shew that at the time when he committed the fact he was possessed of that degree of understanding which enabled him to know that what he was doing was unlawful, the Jury without any difficulty found him guilty of the crime of shooting at Lord Onslow and indeed it is extremely difficult to suppose any case in which insanity as it is called can be proved with any degree of satisfaction upon ones mind unless particular acts are pointed out from whence that insanity is concluded to exist and in this case not any one of the witnesses neither Mrs Pillett nor Mrs Clark nor the last witness proves any one fact which shews a disordered mind they prove his going to the Secretary of State and then being satisfied with

with an answer of Mr Justice that
 was certainly adverse to him and
 telling his wife he hoped that she
 would be satisfied saying that he
 still flattered himself, on what
 grounds we do not know, but he
 states at this moment that he
 has a right to recover for injuries
 in Russia but we know that persons
 who are considered as perfectly sane
 often complain that they have had
 gross injustice done to them though
 no persons but themselves can agree
 that they have any right to that
 which they claim

Gentlemen I have troubled
 you with but few observations
 upon the case and as many I think
 as the nature of the case requires -
 You will first consider whether
 you have any doubt that Mr
 Percival died of the wound he received
 on Monday last - Then secondly
 whether you have any doubt that
 the Prisoner was the person who shot
 off

off the pistol that gave that wound
 to Mr. Perceval and then you will
 consider whether you can have any
 reasonable doubt that this man
 trading as he did and conducting
 himself as he did even on the Sunday
 and the Monday when he attended
 Mr. Roberts to these places was
 possessed of a sufficient degree of
 understanding to enable him to judge
 that the fact of shooting a man maliciously
 and deliberately was a crime against
 every Law human and divine. If
 there is any room to doubt you will
 acquit the Prisoner but if you are
 satisfied in your own minds that
 Mr. Perceval died of the wound
 and that he had a sufficient degree
 of capacity to distinguish between
 good and evil and to know he
 was committing a crime at the time
 you will in that case find him
 guilty.

The Jury retired five minutes
 before

Before six and returned at
ten minutes after six with a
Verdict of Guilty

cler Shelton John Bellingham you
stand convicted of the wilful
murder of the Right Honourable
Spencer Perceval what have you to
say why you should not receive
sentence to die according to Law.

The Prisoner made no answer

cler Recorder

Prisoner at the Bar

You have been convicted by a
most attentive and merciful Jury
of one of the most flagitious crimes
it is in the power of human nature
to perpetrate, wilful and deliberate
murder, a crime which in all ages
and throughout all nations has
justly been held in the highest detes-
tation, odious and abominable as it
is in the eyes of God and man it
presents itself in your case with every
possible feature of aggravation. The
object

1966

object of your blood thirsty vengeance
was endowed with every virtue
that can adorn public and private
life his suavity of manners and
gentleness of deportment disarmed
hostility of its rancour and violence
of its asperity - by his death you
have deprived charity of one of its
most sincere and active friends -
religion of one of its firmest supporters
domestic society of one of its happiest
examples of endearment and felicity
and the country of one of its brightest
ornaments, a man whose abilities
and whose works would probably
have produced lasting benefit to this
Empire and ultimate advantage
to the world Every part of your
iniquitous conduct is strongly
impressed with the foulest character
of atrocious guilt - in the midst of
unarmed friends when defenceless
except in the consciousness of virtue
and confiding in that security which
ought to surround every man in
this

This Christian Country - subtle
 very proud of fulfilling his public
 duty to his Country it was when
 at the very threshold of the Sanctuary
 of the Laws had your infernal
 hand committed this impious
 deed.

To indulge in any conjecture
 as to your motives for this horrid
 act would lead me into an investi-
 gation of all which is bad and
 perfidious in the human heart, the
 more this dreadful diabolical
 transaction is contemplated the
 more does the mind recoil from
 it with repulsive horror for the
 sanguinary nature of a assassination
 is most abhorrent to man as much
 as it is calculated to render bravery
 useless and cowardice predomi-
 nant - justly therefore does your
 crime merit the execration of
 mankind and the voice of God
 has declared that he who shed the
 man's blood by man shall his
 blood

1

Blood be shed" Publicly therefore
must you expiate that crime by
which you have so much disgraced
your indignant Country and I
trust that the example of your
ignominious fate may duly operate
to deter all others from the repetition
of a crime which must infallibly
attract the vengeance of a justly
offended Deity - A very short time
indeed remains for you to suppli-
cate the Throne of Grace for that
mercy which public justice forbids
you to expect in this world - I sin-
cerely hope that the interval which
has passed between the perpetration
of your horrid crime and the present
moment has not been unemployed
in imploring pardon of the Almighty
and it is my most fervent wish
that your fervent prayer may
through the merits of our Redeemer
find acceptance

It only remains for me to
pafs

pass upon you the dreadful sentence
of the law, it is, That you John
Bellingham be taken to the place
from whence you came and that
on Monday next you be conveyed
to a place of execution and there be
hanged by the neck until you be
dead and that your body be
afterwards dissected and
anatomized and may God
Almightly have mercy on your soul





