

selves satisfied with the treatment pursued by Dr. Button under their superintendence. Dr. Button declares that his opinions upon the subject of restraint remain unaltered. It is to be assumed that his practice continues, as at Hanwell, to be in accordance with his principles, and if so, the questions must all be answered in the affirmative. God forbid that they should be so; but where does the truth lie? Has Dr. Button not dared to practise what he has dared to advocate? or have the cases in which restraints have been inflicted been excluded from the report? The magistrates of Dorsetshire must sooner or later, in their own defence, impale their superintendent on one horn of this dilemma—it is immaterial for the good cause upon which. I am, Sir, yours,

A LOOKER-ON.

March 21, 1842.

MOTIONS OF THE BRAIN.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I chanced once again to refer to Mr. Combe's account of the case of the young lady in New York, and feel so justly indignant at the manner in which my statement of that case is attempted by each of my three opponents, Mr. Sampson, Mr. Davey, and Mr. Hytche, to be represented as exaggerated, when, in fact, in my notice of it, the extravagance of the original account is greatly kept out of view, that as an act of justice to myself, and for the purpose of satisfying your readers, I must earnestly solicit a place to Mr. Combe's own words. The account occurs at p. 279 of the second volume of "The Notes on the United States;" and the case was that of a young lady, who at four years of age had a fall from a window, by which the skull was extensively fractured, but without the *pia mater* being injured. A part of the posterior-superior portion of the skull was removed, and the integuments drawn over. The part of the skull removed corresponds to the site of the organs of self-esteem and love of approbation.

"With the permission of her father," writes Mr. Combe, "I kept my hands, for some minutes, gently pressing on the site of the injury. . . . When I began to talk to the child she was shy and bashful, and at first would scarcely speak. The vivid movements in self-esteem indicated that, amid her extreme bashfulness, that organ was active. As I continued to converse with her, and succeeded in putting her at her ease, the movements in self-esteem decreased, while those in love of approbation continued. I spoke to her about her lessons and attainments, not in flattering terms, but with the design of exciting self-esteem, and the movements increased. Again, I soothed her, and they diminished. Her father gave her seve-

ral questions in mental arithmetic to solve: she was puzzled and made an intellectual effort, and the peculiar movements in the organ of self-esteem and love of approbation ceased. . . . She solved the question, and we praised her; the peculiar movements returned. . . . I took out a piece of paper and began to write. . . . She looked at my writing, and as all attention was now withdrawn from herself, . . . I placed my hand on the integuments, and only the gentle and regular pulsations of the arterial system were perceptible."

Those of your readers who compare my account of the above experiments, with the most unjust and unfair criticisms upon it, by my opponents, cannot fail to entertain very moderate opinions of the candour of these gentlemen. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT DICK, M.D.

APPOINTMENTS AND DUTIES

OF

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF UNIONS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg leave to hand you the accompanying letter from the President of the Royal College of Surgeons, upon the appointments and duties of medical officers of unions under the Poor-law Amendment Act, for insertion in THE LANCET, if you see fit to give them a place in that publication. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS HOVELL.

Clapton, March 21, 1842.

4, Berkeley-street, Berkeley-square,
March 12, 1842.

My dear Sir,—I transmit you, herewith, a copy of the medical order of the poor-law commissioners with their explanatory letter accompanying it. You will perceive that the mode of obtaining the services of medical men by tender is abolished, and that they will, on the expiration of the present contracts, hold their places in future, subject only to death, resignation, or legal disqualification; and whenever from circumstances it may be necessary to ask publicly for the services of any physician, surgeon, or apothecary, the sum to be paid for such services is required to be stated; and as it must have been previously approved by the poor-law commissioners, a return to the system of tender will be prevented, but which without this check would have been in all probability attempted.

You and the profession at large will readily acquit me of having had anything to do with the qualification part of the order, amended as it is by the explanatory letter. It was my wish that the double qualification of physician of any university or legally-