

J. WALLIS, L.R.C.P.Ed., has been appointed Assistant Medical Officer to the Durham County Asylum, Sedgfield.

H. M. L. WALTERS, M.A., has been appointed Chaplain to the Oxford Lunatic Asylum at Littlemore.

R. R. B. WICKHAM, L.R.C.P.Ed., has been appointed Assistant Medical Officer to the Royal Asylum for the Insane, Morningside, Edinburgh.

PRESENTATION.—A handsome mediæval metal gilt inkstand, with candlesticks to match, with the arms of the Asylum on an enamelled shield, have been presented to Henry Hawkins, M.A., late Chaplain of the Sussex Lunatic Asylum, Haywards Heath, as a parting gift from the Chairman and several members of the committee of visitors, the officers, attendants, artisans, and servants, who united in a joint subscription for this purpose.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE.

GENTLEMEN,

I take the liberty to call your attention to the subjoined correspondence between the Commissioners of Lunacy and myself, and to ask you to allow the same to appear in the columns of your journal; so that the widest publicity may be given, and on public grounds, to the facts stated.

It is well to remember that *clause 26*, alluded to in my letter, makes it incumbent on the proprietors of licensed houses for the insane to give "*notice of dismissal for misconduct of attendants*" to the Commissioners of Lunacy.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES G. DAVEY, M.D.

Northwood, near Bristol, Feby. 12, 1868.

Northwood, Bristol, Jany. 3, 1868.

SIR,

Reverting to a former letter of mine of October last, a letter suggested by clause 26—16 and 17 Vict., cap. 96—and which informs you of the charge of larceny made by me against *Henry Salvidge*, lately an attendant here in my service, I have now to report that on or after the trial (which took place at Gloucester, January 1st, 1868) of the said *Henry Salvidge*, he was acquitted of the crime named.

In connection with this case I think it right to call the attention of the Commissioners of Lunacy to the fact that the several articles of apparel, &c., including trousers, handkerchiefs, collars, &c., &c., and one umbrella, the properties of several patients in this asylum, though found at Foulton, and in his, *Henry Salvidge's*, possession, and now returned to my care, were held to have been given to him (H. S.) by the gentlemen here alluded to; and so it was that he has escaped with all impunity.

I have the authority of my solicitor to state that had a formal notice, duly posted about my establishment, been in existence, to the effect that no attendant was authorised to receive presents of any kind from patients, he (*Henry Salvidge*) would then have been found guilty of the theft, and punished accordingly.

I should add that there is a stringent and well-known rule (though not posted in this asylum) that no servant shall on any account whatever receive presents from patients (ladies or gentlemen), and to this "rule" all prominence was given by myself and the other witnesses (matron and attendant) against the person before named.

The above statement you may be inclined to consider not a little noteworthy and of much interest to medical men who are proprietors of asylums. If this be the case may I venture to ask, through you, for the permission of the Commissioners of Lunacy to publish, with as little delay as possible, the foregoing facts in a medical journal?

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
JAMES G. DAVEY, M.D.

P.S.—Since writing the preceding letter, a report of the case has appeared in a Gloucester paper. The words occur: "*The defence was that the articles had been given to the accused by the patients themselves and,*" it is added, "*as the witnesses could identify none of them as belonging to the patients, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty.*" The truth, however, is that each one and all of the "*articles*" were *bonâ fide* and in fact identified, and distinctly sworn to by the "*witnesses.*"

J. G. D.

Office of Commissioners in Lunacy,
19, Whitehall Place, S.W.,
9th January, 1868.

SIR,

I am directed by the Commissioners to reply to your letter of the 3rd instant, and to state that they have no objection to your publication of the facts to which you therein refer. You are quite at liberty to act in the matter as you think fit.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
THOMAS MARTIN.
For the Secretary.

DR. DAVEY.

The following letter appeared in the *British Medical Journal* of the 8th February:—

" SIR,

" In No. 365 of the 'British Medical Journal' (p. 600), I find a letter, in which Dr. Claye Shaw, Assistant Medical Officer of the Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum, overwhelms me with abuse. I should not heed such a merely personal attack, which I have by no means provoked, if I could be sure that all your readers were acquainted with the point in question; but as this is probably not the case, I trust you will allow me a short reply.

" Dr. Sheppard, the senior officer of the Asylum, has recommended a new method of treatment for destructive maniacal patients—a method which has been much discussed as well in England as in Germany. In common with many others. I am of opinion that this method is prejudicial and inexpedient; and have stated in my paper that the recommendation of this method by a physician to the insane ('Irrenarzt') could only be understood by the consideration of the fact that this physician, as is actually the case in Colney Hatch, is overburdened by the excessive number of patients under his care. I have further pointed out, that the numerous opponents, also existing in Germany, to the 'non-restraint system,' would take advantage of the recommendation of Dr. Sheppard's plan, in order to spread distrust in the English system of treatment. My own intention was to prevent this with regard to Germany, by showing that Dr. Sheppard's method was not a necessary consequence of non-restraint, but of the enormous 'agglomeration' of patients; that, therefore, the fault was to be looked for in the Colney Hatch Asylum itself. I do not think that I have thus

committed any wrong, or that I have been guilty of indiscretion ; and I scarcely need assure you, that I should not have mentioned Dr. Sheppard's name if the subject which he defends had not been already well known and discussed. It is not I who have rendered his name inseparable from the subject. Why, then, does Dr. Claye Shaw heap injuries upon me ? Because I have stated that I have seen the system vaunted by his senior officer (to shut up destructive patients naked) carried out on a patient in the Colney Hatch Asylum ! I confess that I cannot understand this ; for the indignation which Dr. Shaw exhibits at this statement of mine, is plainly a reproach to his senior officer who recommends this method. Even if, therefore, the facts which I have stated were incorrect, I should not see cause for the manner in which he abuses me.* I maintain, however, the facts which I have stated to their full extent ; and am further quite certain that I have expressed to Dr. Shaw my disagreement with his plan of treatment. I must therefore assume that Dr. Shaw, owing to my imperfect manner of expressing myself in a foreign tongue, has not quite understood me. With regard, however, to the farther peculiar statement of my honourable *confrère*, that I had been 'anxious to enforce some ideas of mine on lesions of the spinal cord in general paralysis,' I beg leave to remind him of his spontaneous request to send him my articles, in order that he might translate them into English ; which, unluckily, I have forgotten to do. If this was not likewise a mere act of courtesy—as from certain words in his letter I must now believe it was—it shows that Dr. Shaw took then, at all events, some interest in the subject.

"I deeply regret, sir, to be forced thus to repel an attack which, in such a form, ought not to occur amongst men of science ; but I was all the more compelled to this short reply, as the attack came from England, where, during the whole of my stay, I was always received in the most hospitable manner.

"I am, &c.,

"DR. C. WESTPHAL."

"Berlin, January, 1868."

British Medical Journal, February 8th.

* If, for instance, Dr. Shaw had visited some of our German Asylums in which the strait-waistcoat is still used, and had related in an English journal that he had found several patients in the strait-waistcoat in one or other asylum, would any of those German physicians who approve of the system of mechanical restraint consider himself offended ? Most certainly not.