

meant to be scrambled for like farthings, and appropriated, like them, by the most successful scrambler, to his own use; he should rather consider them as so many fountains opened by men of learning and ability, at which all are at liberty to drink. The publication of a discovery is a gift to the public, and the public, I conceive, have a legal right to the gift, (if it be published by the discoverer.) On the same ground that a bequest is distributed, the intention of the testator is the guide to the distribution. But Mr. Bullock has made himself heir-at-law and residuary legatee in this case.

I have taken up my pen, in the endeavour (perhaps a vain one) to show, that if the grant of a patent can hold good for the preparation of amorphous quinine, there can be nothing in justice to deter any one from patenting any chemical which may be newly discovered; and I hold it of very great importance, that at the outset of such a proceeding we should arrest its progress, and thus prevent that which is now only an isolated case being developed into a principle. We have already too much of quack doctors, quack medicines, and secret proceedings, and no means should be left untried which may be at all calculated to make medicine and pharmacy the branches of our profession equally enlightened, honourable, and liberal. I hope it will be distinctly understood that I am contending only for a principle, and not against an individual; if, therefore, my observations appear invidious, they are not meant to be offensive, though, it must be confessed, in these days of professional oppression, it is hard to refrain from a free expression of opinion.

Having stated the whole case fairly, it now only remains for the profession to consider whether it would be advisable to appeal to her Majesty that she may exercise her power, as sovereign, to claim a *scire facias*, and declare the afore-mentioned patent as void, on the grounds above specified. If her Majesty's favour can thus be obtained, we shall, for the future, have a case to refer to, and shall, consequently, be enabled to thwart all endeavours of a like kind, should any such be made; for it cannot be denied that, in this instance, we are suffering under a burden we are not called upon to bear, and the poor are, in a great measure, shut out from the advantage they might obtain if so valuable a medicine as the amorphous quinine could be purchased at a cheap rate.

Wandsworth, Sept. 1846.

REMARKS ON

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS IN LUNACY,

AND THE MODE IN WHICH ITS DUTIES ARE PERFORMED,

As instanced in the atrocities of Haydock Lodge.

By WILLIAM SMITH, Esq.,

LATE HOUSE-SURGEON TO THE LINCOLN LUNATIC ASYLUM, AND MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HOSPITALS FOR THE INSANE.

IN THE LANCET for September 12th, I find some remarks by Mr. F. J. Wintle, of the Warneford Asylum, who appears to be desirous of breaking a lance in defence of those deeply persecuted individuals, the commissioners in lunacy.

The remarks referred to by Mr. Wintle apply to those gentlemen in their public capacity: they are receiving large sums from government, and all their travelling expenses &c. are defrayed out of the public purse. I therefore consider that they, as well as any other body of public men, are fair game for attack, provided they do not display proper vigilance in the discharge of their duties.

Mr. Wintle appears to wonder what grounds there are for any attack upon these immaculate gentlemen. Has Mr. Wintle seen the *Times* newspaper for August 27th, 1846; if so, is he of opinion that the commissioners faithfully discharged their duty of supervision in the case of the Haydock-Lodge Asylum? By whom were those iniquitous and revolting practices upon the defenceless patients brought to light? Not by the commissioners in lunacy certainly! notwithstanding the report of those atrocities, and other gross instances of neglect, forwarded to Dr. Hume by Mr. William Graham, the resident surgeon (at that time) of the Lincoln Asylum—a person who ought to know something of the management of lunatics. How comes it that these learned gentlemen did not publicly denounce the principle of a private asylum being conducted by Mr. Charles Mott, who, if not actually at the time an assistant poor-law commissioner, at all events was an auditor of the very district wherein his own private madhouse was situated. Their ignorance relative to this improper connexion is no excuse for them; as Mr. Wakley justly observes, “they ought to have known of it.” Then again, were they not grossly culpable in not having made a searching investigation imme-

diately on the receipt of Mr. W. Graham's complaint in November? Their investigation does not take place until the following May. The thanks of the community are justly due to Mr. Wakley and Dr. Roberts for the steps they have taken to bring the affair to light: the following letter of the last-named gentleman, addressed to Mr. Wakley, appears to show the thing up most completely.

“Castle Hill, Bangor, August 23rd, 1846.

“SIR,—Though personally a stranger, I am inclined to address you by having seen the notice of a motion you are about to make in reference to Haydock Lodge. My object in doing so is to call your attention to the lunacy commission, with a view to show the utter inefficiency of that body, as at present constituted, to protect the unfortunate inmates of lunatic asylums against brutal and inhuman treatment. I brought the cruel treatment experienced by patients confined in Haydock Lodge, and specifically the case of the Rev. Mr. Richards, under the official notice of the commissioners early in the month of February. When some weeks had elapsed, I became convinced that some secret influence was at work to cushion the serious charges which I had preferred, so as to screen the proprietors of the establishment: under this conviction, the correctness of which subsequent circumstances have fully confirmed, I prepared a petition, which the Hon. W. O. Stanley did me the favour of presenting to the House of Commons.

“In calling for a return of the documents from the commissioners, I had declared my intention to bring the subject before parliament. Subsequently, in the month of May, I was requested by the secretary, Mr. Lutwidge, to furnish the commissioners with the names &c. of the witnesses upon whose testimony I relied to prove the charges I had made. In the month of June, to my great astonishment, I was informed by Mr. Stanley that the commissioners had adopted the novel and extraordinary course of making a report to the Secretary of State, in which they impugned the credibility of some of my witnesses without ever having seen or asked them a single question. In the month of July, after the publication of the petition, and the notice taken of its contents by the *Times* newspaper, the witnesses were summoned with such precipitancy, as to render it almost impossible for them to appear in due time at the commissioners' office in London; indeed, one female was served with a summons at half past twelve in the day, calling upon her to appear in Spring Gardens at nine o'clock the following morning. As I before showed, my charges had been preferred in February, and yet, serious as those charges were, and involving, as they did, the treatment of nearly 500, mostly pauper, lunatics, yet the commissioners took no efficient steps to investigate them till the 10th of July. But it seems that the wretched state of the inmates of Haydock Lodge had been brought specifically under the notice of the commissioners as far back as November; for on my return home from London, on the 12th of July, I found a letter addressed to me by a medical gentleman residing at Crewe, (Mr. Graham,) in Cheshire. This gentleman states explicitly, that having visited Haydock in the month of November, he reported the dreadful state the place was in to Dr. Hume, and another commissioner. That letter is now in the possession of Mr. Stanley; its contents, in substance, are to the following effect. He visited Haydock Lodge in November last; he found the place, at eleven o'clock in the day, shamefully dirty, and the male patients ragged and filthy. There were two persons dying with diarrhoea in an apartment that was used as a sitting-room by other patients; he found a patient named William Whittaker, who had been removed from the Lincoln Asylum to Haydock Lodge, with his face so black and disfigured with bruises, that he could hardly recognise him; he, though the resident medical officer of the Lincoln Lunatic Asylum, was not permitted to see any of the private patients. (Mr. Graham then expressly states that he immediately afterwards reported what he had seen to Dr. Hume and another commissioner.) I have been refused a copy of the report which the commissioners made to the Home Office, impugning the credibility of my witnesses before they examined them! nor have I seen the one which they made after that ceremony had been gone through. I have, however, good reason to know that every allegation contained in my petition was more than fully substantiated by the evidence produced; and I am fully convinced, had it not been for the presentation of that petition, and the notice taken of its contents by the *Times* newspaper, that the enormities of Haydock Lodge might have been perpetrated with all but impunity. The housekeeper that was at Haydock, and whose conduct was referred to pointedly in the evidence, is now, I believe, the matron of an union workhouse,

and my firm belief is, that the parties connected with the poor-law commission have been more extensively concerned, and more deeply pecuniarily interested, than the public can be aware of, in the establishments where poor, badly clothed, and underfed lunatics, have been doomed to suffer imprisonment and hard labour.—I am, Sir, yours very respectfully,

“To Thomas Wakley, Esq.”

“O. O. ROBERTS.”

This letter, unless its contents can be disproved, will go far, I think, to convince any person that very gross abuses have existed for some time in the Haydock Asylum, and that these said abuses had escaped the attention of the learned commissioners, whose duty it is to protect the unfortunate lunatic. Again, there appears to have been great apathy exhibited by the commissioners in not causing an immediate investigation on the receipt of Mr. Graham's complaint in November, whilst their inquiry does not take place until May. In plain truth, it was forced upon them by the petition of Mr. Roberts, and the notice of that petition in the *Times* newspaper. They do not appear to me to have shown any great desire to discover abuses, else why delay their official inquiry from November until May? Again, in the first instance, they delegate the office of inquiry to the visiting justices. What, in the name of common sense, do they receive their handsome salaries for, if they are not to look into these gross abuses? The very circumstance of there having been 112 deaths, in one year, out of an average number of 450 patients, ought at once to have aroused, in the minds of the commissioners, suspicion of bad management somewhere; but instead of that, the commissioners keep dreaming on until the affair is brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Roberts. Their first inquiry, too, appears to have been little better than a farce, when a second batch of commissioners, no less than four, in their united wisdom, are despatched to Haydock, and make the important discovery that the previous visitors had been completely humbugged, and had dust thrown in their eyes. What, again, could be more absurd than conducting an investigation at their own rooms, in London, of circumstances which occurred at Haydock, and where they might have had all the witnesses upon the spot; and where, in some particular cases, the evidence of patients themselves might throw some light upon the matter? Mr. Wakley's arguments are, in my opinion, very sound, that it would be preposterous to allow the commissioners to conduct any further investigation at Haydock, as they would, in reality, be sitting in judgment upon their own neglect. The most satisfactory plan would be, to appoint half-a-dozen medical superintendents from as many county asylums. Taken indiscriminately, these gentlemen would have no personal interest in the matter, and their practical experience would teach them how to get at the truth. Had the commissioners in lunacy done their duty, they would at once have reported the case to the Lord Chancellor, and recommended a suspension of the licence, which would have done away with the huge charnel-house (it deserves no better appellation) for lunatics at Haydock. Somewhen about the month of November, 1845, I visited the establishment at Haydock, for the purpose of conveying thither a pauper belonging to one of the Derbyshire unions. Although my name was attached to the patient's admission paper, showing that I was a medical man; and though I stated, further, that I had held the office of house-surgeon to the Lincoln Asylum for three years; it was with the greatest difficulty that I could obtain permission to inspect the pauper portion of the establishment, (the private patients I did not see,) and then only after remarking rather warmly, “that any establishment for the reception of lunatics which would not bear the inspection of a regularly qualified surgeon must be very badly conducted indeed.” At length, I was permitted a hasty inspection of the wards. How different from my reception at the Hanwell Asylum, where, on one occasion, I spent about four hours in the wards, and on another, two hours; in the latter case, accompanied by Dr. Conolly, the talented physician of the establishment, whose willingness and ability to communicate the results of his vast experience are beyond all praise!

But to return to Haydock. I was so impressed with the air of exclusiveness and mystery which reigned throughout the establishment, and convinced, from past experience, of the evils likely to result to the patients from the withdrawal of such a powerful means of protection as free inspection by the public eye, that on my return to Derbyshire I addressed a long letter to Mr. Mott on the subject, advocating very strongly the principle that public inspection was the greatest safeguard from abuse which the unfortunate lunatic possessed. In order to show that others of more experience than myself hold the same views, I will quote some extracts from a letter

addressed by Dr. Charlesworth, the senior physician of the Lincoln Asylum, to a General Board of Governors of that institution. “My jealousy on the point of facility of inspection is extreme. Viewing this privilege, qualified as it is by our rules, as one of the principal safeguards of the patients, I regard every step towards its diminution as a step towards maltreatment, and every impediment thrown in its way as introductory to abuse. Whenever the domestic officers of an establishment are ill-disposed, or overbearing, or indolent, or for any other reason averse from observation, specious arguments will be found to preserve their domain from intruding eyes as much as possible, and so long as the formal words, ‘improper to be seen,’ are to be accepted as an unquestionable reason for shrouding from inspection even the weekly-appointed visitors, any insane patient to whom they are applied, a convenient cloak will be ever at hand to cover any severity, neglect, or other abuse.

“From the peculiar nature of an asylum for the insane, the most horrible abuses may exist within its walls without suspicion, and almost without the possibility of detection. Sir Andrew Halliday has observed, ‘The mystery which has been made to hover round the precincts of a madhouse was sufficient to baffle common inquiry; and the utter seclusion so insidiously inculcated, made it next to impossible to discover the scenes of horror that took place within its walls.’ Hence, our attention should ever be directed to a system of prevention which can be rendered effectual only by keeping our grounds, courts, galleries, cells, offices, and, as much as possible, the persons of the patients open to that rational inspection which our rules have provided for, and which general experience has shown to be safe, as well as necessary.

“The surest evidence of the good conduct of any establishment, is its facility of access. Well-disposed officers will be found invariably to court inspection; they feel a pride in the cleanliness, good order, and kind treatment, which are instantly visible to an intelligent observer.”

The governors, in approving of the sound principles contained in the above letter, go on to remark:—“That the flagrant abuses lately brought to light before Parliament, such as foul, offensive, and unventilated apartments; personal uncleanness, and neglect; brutal means of restraint; harsh, unfeeling demeanour in the attendants; and, above all, improper associations in convalescence, never can be effectually prevented without a full and free inspection by governors, and strangers officially introduced.”

Are not these remarks singularly applicable to the late case of the Haydock Asylum? Of a truth, they are, if we inquire into the gross abuses which formerly existed to such a frightful extent in Old Bedlam, the York Asylum, and elsewhere. We shall find the same jealousy of inspection, the same dread of the public eye. Let us not hear that “the vigilant inspection of the commissioners, and the reports founded thereon, have led to the great and blessed improvements now going on in every hospital and asylum in the kingdom.” I deny this *in toto*. The grand improvements in the management of the insane, or most of them, had their origin in the free discussion and controversies which took place in *THE LANCET* and other independent journals, relative to the non-restraint system. Public curiosity was excited; the best-managed asylums, such as Lincoln, Hanwell, Northampton, &c., freely courted public inspection, and boldly threw open even their refractory wards to the public eye. What was the consequence? Why, people began to discover that the unfortunate lunatic was not the ferocious, untameable brute that interested parties, studious of their own ease and comfort, had represented them to be. Chains, leglocks, restraint-chairs, and other abominable and diabolical contrivances, disappeared, as it were, like magic, and were replaced by quiet work-rooms filled with orderly and industrious patients; wards formerly filled with shrieks and execrations were now decked with fancy garlands, and anon resounded to the merry dance. Let us not, however, for a moment, delude ourselves with the idea that the commissioners have wrought these happy changes: they—good, worthy men!—joined heart and soul with the restrainers, and, in their solitary report to the Lord Chancellor, commented upon the restless, noisy condition of the patients at Hanwell, Lincoln, and elsewhere. They would have been better employed in correcting the diet table, or preventing the mortality at Haydock Lodge.

Sir George Grey, in his reply to Mr. Wakley, remarks, that “the state of our pauper lunatic asylums is most discreditable,” but says nothing of the state of the licensed houses—the private madhouses. For one abuse existing in the former, I will assert, without fear of contradiction, twenty will be found in the latter establishments; ay, and in even many of those set

apart for the higher classes! And why is this? Because, forsooth, the feelings of the friends must be consulted. A dangerous concession! Mr. Samuel Tuke observes on this subject, "I believe that I am not too sanguine when I say, that for one evil arising from accidental visitation, ninety-nine will be prevented. The evils of visitation are speculative bugbears, to which practical men have too often found it convenient to give the character of reality."

In conclusion, I must beg to observe, that if Mr. Wintle is convinced "that the commissioners discharge their duties with great patience, kindness, and address, and with a determination to search out every abuse," I am by no means convinced; and until the facts so clearly laid down in Mr. Roberts' letter be entirely disproved, I shall be disposed to concur with the opinion expressed by Mr. Wakley, that the commissioners, "instead of being a benefit to the public, and a safeguard to the lunatics, may be the very reverse, by lulling the public into a false security."

South Derbyshire, Sept. 1846.

[Mr. Smith asks, in a postscript—"Could any correspondent of *THE LANCET* afford information on the following heads:—1. What is the exact date of the opening of Haydock Lodge for the reception of patients? 2. What admissions and re-admissions had occurred up to the end of August last? 3. What number of deaths has taken place; how many of private, and how many of pauper patients? What was the dietary of Haydock during the year that a hundred and twelve deaths took place? 4. How many male and how many female attendants are employed in the establishment? Possibly, answers to these queries might throw a little light upon the management of this humane institution!"]

THE LUNACY COMMISSION, AND THE TRUE FRIENDS OF THE LUNATIC POOR.

"—Tulit alter honores."—VIRG.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR,—Without fully coinciding with Mr. Smith in his energetic denunciations of the lunatic commission, I cannot do otherwise than demur to the equally partial position taken up by Mr. Wintle in his defence. This gentleman informs us that he has had eighteen years' experience in the superintendence of the insane, and then proceeds to state that "the great and blessed improvements" now proceeding in every hospital and asylum in the kingdom are due to "the vigilant inspection of the commissioners, and the reports founded thereon." To me it appears that the commission itself is simply the offspring of public feeling and sympathy, on behalf of the insane, and not the "fons et origo" of the good and "blessed" results which Mr. Wintle so warmly eulogizes. Has not Mr. Wintle's own career contributed in some degree to the "great and blessed" results? And have not his letters to *THE LANCET* (which, by the by, were anonymous) suggested a more rational and successful plan of treatment in cases of insanity? Then why rob himself of a good fame by yielding all the praise to the commissioners in lunacy, and why let them know him as their advocate, by writing his name and place in full in the pages of a journal where he has heretofore rejoiced in the simple initials of "F. J. W.?" Surely it will not be denied that the commissioners have produced these results, writes Mr. Wintle, and with a chivalry worthy of Sancho Panza himself, he enters his protest against the bold and pithy terms of Mr. Smith; but, unfortunately for Mr. Wintle's arguments, it is most positively denied; and further than this, their reports and conduct have been such as to cause intense alarm in the minds of the visiting justices of Hanwell, lest through their influence all the horrors of the ancient system should be again introduced into "every hospital and asylum in the kingdom." The magistrates thus write: "If the visiting justices have ventured upon this occasion, where so much, as they believe, is at stake, to express their apprehensions in strong terms, it is because they cannot forget the recorded opinions of the commissioners on the subject of non-restraint contained in their Report, presented to the Lord Chancellor in 1844—apprehensions which have not been lessened by anything contained in their Report to Sir James Graham. They cannot contemplate, without dread, the possible introduction of the opposite system—a system as injurious as it is cruel, and from which the asylum of the metropolitan county is now happily free." Mr. Serjeant Adams, an assistant judge, in reference to the commissioners and their

Report, thus writes:—"It is a melancholy reflection, that the annual average of deaths amongst the paupers in the metropolitan private asylums, under the superintendence of the commissioners, should double in amount the average of deaths in Hanwell: it is a more melancholy reflection, that the average deaths of pauper patients in those asylums should more than double the average of deaths in the same asylums of patients not being paupers. The most melancholy reflection is, that the commissioners should have been silent as to these startling facts, and should think it a remarkable circumstance, "that county asylums should require enlargement." And the same writer further says, in reference to some of the commissioners' statements,—"They must elect between wilful misrepresentation and culpable neglect"! I could quote the sentiments of many more benevolent individuals on the same subject, but the above will suffice to show that Mr. Smith is not singular in his opinions. That the commissioners in lunacy are not entitled to the high praise so courteously tendered to them by the amiable superintendent of the Warneford Asylum is proved by the late exposure of the proceedings at Haydock Lodge; by their advocacy of restraint; by their desire to introduce large dormitories into asylums for the sake of economy; by their opposition, from the same motive, to well-constructed asylums, such as the Derby; and by their urging that the expenditure dependent on making asylums fire-proof be in future avoided. The truth is, that the "great and blessed improvements now going on," are due (apart from Mr. Tuke, of York) to philanthropic members of our own profession, in this and other countries, more especially to Pinel, in France; to Woodward, in America; and to Conolly, in England. To the last-mentioned the insane poor in this country owe an endless debt of gratitude; for it is chiefly due to his exertions, and to his feeling and eloquent reports and lectures, that their condition has gained the attention and sympathy of an enlightened public: and by these, as published in *THE LANCET*, and quoted in the House of Commons, "the members of Mr. Wintle's profession" have been stirred up to protect the helpless insane, not only from "smirking briefless barristers," but from all who would write thus:—"We do not recommend the providing public asylums for such a number of persons upon the expensive scale on which county asylums have hitherto been erected. . . . The best union workhouses have in general cost not more than 40*l.* per head. . . . The great expenses of a lunatic hospital are unnecessary for incurable patients."—*Commissioners' Report*.

To Dr. Conolly, then, and such as he, be all the honour! for they have been, and are, the pioneers in the path of improvement and mercy,—to whom the commissioners have extended but little sympathy and support, notwithstanding the praise (which I hope may be duly appreciated) which has been lavished on these worthies by the superintendent of the Warneford Asylum.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

September, 1846.

PALMAN QUI MERUIT FERAT.

ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE SCIENCE OF MEDICINE.

By P. G. MAYNE, M.D., Leeds.

MUCH of the technical language of medicine, and of the several branches of science which it involves, has, it must be confessed, but moderate pretensions to propriety or correctness. Terms are often compounded of the most fanciful and far-fetched ingredients, from the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Arabic, Japanese, Indian, Saxon, Belgic, &c. Adjectives disagree with substantives in gender, if not, also, in number and case. Substantive is associated with substantive; but, like an ill-matched pair, neither governing nor governed in any case. In short, rules of syntax are set at nought, etymology is strained and over-taxed, and, as in some revolutionary state, instead of our possessing an authorized and well-assayed sterling currency of language, each man coins for himself, according to his occasions and the material he can employ; the effect of which is, the introduction of many specimens literally base and spurious.

Having been engaged for a considerable time past in an attempt to improve our professional terminology, and, if possible, to bring it more under the regulation of classic laws, the investigations necessarily attendant thereon have unveiled numerous existing imperfections, inaccuracies, and errors, which, in different circumstances, would escape notice, or might be considered too trivial to call for interference. How far that attempt shall be successful, my professional brethren