from what I have learnt, I think there are good grounds for believing that by the recent proceedings an efficient, intelligent, and benevolent officer has been lost in Dr. Barry to the institution.

That you, Sir, may be instrumental in converting the old MADHOUSES into modern HOSPITALS, for the cure and care of invalids, and into SCHOOLS FOR TEACHING A VERY INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT BRANCH OF MEDICAL EDUCATION, and that you may be always ready and willing to help, in your powerful way, to aid the few who are for doing right, against the many who are, from mere habit and prejudice, for doing wrong, is the hope of an old reader of THE LANCET, who subscribes himself

Q, IN CLAPHAM.

October 8, 1841.

FINAL REMARKS OF MR. BODINGTON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I should not have again claimed your indulgence, had not the last note of the "Looker-on" contained a cool but malicious attack, intended to damage my private character in the estimation of your readers; he speaks of the "temper, style, and habits," of Mr. Bodington: the "Looker-on" should know that the same susceptibility of temperament which would lead a man to express, in indignant terms, his feelings towards one who had had the temerity to attack his motives and principles of conduct, after the manner of the "Looker-on," when he charged the proprietors of "private asylums" with various sins, and, amongst the rest, with "keeping *their patients unduly under their charge, for the sake of the profit*;" and that in a widely-circulated Journal, screening himself, at the same time, under a fictitious signature, might, under a different kind of excitement, moved by far other feelings, be the best adapted to feel for, to sympathise with, and treat with kindness and humanity, the "bereft of reason." Therefore it does not follow that because the "Looker-on," in the abuse of his rational faculties, has been treated with severity, that they who are not accountable for their actions should receive similar treatment. It was anything but "amiable" in the "Looker-on" to cast forth such an *inuendo*.

Then, as to the "style," why the "occasion" begets the *style*; when the "Looker-on" issued his charges and condemnations against the private asylums, was not his style jaunty, vain, and shallow, and, therefore, necessarily productive, for its correction, of a style severe and sharp? But what does he mean by talking of Mr. Bodington's "habits?" What does he know of them? This is a very "unkind cut," indeed, and worthy of the "Looker-on." Why, they are best known to those around me, and I am not conscious that they are much inferior to

those of the generality of men, though I have nothing to boast of, and I *could* recount some "habits" which I *have not*, but with which the "Looker-on" is perfectly familiar. I shall have great pleasure, indeed, if ever the time should arrive when I can have the opportunity of *looking on* the "Looker-on," undisguised, and refer to the subject matter of this correspondence *vivâ voce*; which he fairly promises me shall be the case whenever an inquiry is made before "*a proper tribunal*:" until when, I move,—and I hope the "Looker-on" will second it,—that this dispute be adjourned. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE BODINGTON.

October 26, 1841.

WESTMINSTER HOSPITAL.

REPLY OF MR. CURREY TO MR. HOLT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Mr. B. W. Holt's statement, as he says, of the true facts of the case contained in my *supposed* (?) account of the treatment of my son in Westminster Hospital, confirms more strongly the opinion I had formed, that although great care and attention, in *some respects*, may have been paid, he was not as skilfully treated in others as he might have been. Mr. Holt states, that his leg was secured with the "admirable junks," &c. &c., "and that it was thought by all present an utter impossibility for the leg to be moved;" and he concludes by stating, "I never had a case which gave me so much trouble, as I can prove, from sheer necessity having *set and reset that child's leg more than twenty times*! At intervals it made such *maniacal screeches*, as to prevent the other patients getting any rest." The unhappy boy's sufferings, no doubt, caused him so to do. Is surgical mechanism at so low an ebb, I ask, that nothing could be contrived to secure his limb in a proper manner? I cannot believe it is so. How do surgeons manage in adult lunatic cases? Mr. Holt passes over the *trifling circumstance* of Mr. Guthrie's name having been affixed to the boy's bed-head for *nine weeks*! Was not Mr. Guthrie his superior? and does he wish it to be supposed that he took the responsibility on himself of setting my boy's leg *twenty times* without consulting that gentleman, when he found his junks, &c. failed? When passing the board, the chairman asked me if the child was fit to go out? I answered, "Mr. Holt says he is;" and I imagined that all was correct, as the leg was bandaged up. If superior surgeons in hospitals do not look after their patients, *particularly when their names are affixed to their beds*, do they not neglect their duty? I remain, Sir, your obliged humble servant,

GEORGE CURREY.

5, Granby-place, New-cut, Lambeth.