the tables aright, the first admissions were 1,206 in 1889, and 1,420 in 1892—an increase of 17 per cent. in four years; while the death-rate in the city asylums would indicate a much larger increase of new cases. For, in an average asylum population increasing from 4,835 in 1889 to 5,575 in 1892, the deaths and recoveries were 1,874 (deaths), and 815 (recoveries)—the deaths increasing from 193 in 1889 to 589 in 1892; while the recoveries were only 186, 273, 190, and 166 in the four successive years, at the end of which the resident population, which had been about 4,800 in October, 1888, had risen to 5,767 in October, 1892—a gain of 20 per cent. in four years, in spite of deaths amounting to nearly 40 per cent. of the population resident at the beginning of the period. Here the supply of new cases must have been enormous, unless the mortality was unnaturally great. And accordingly we find that 951 of the 1,874 deaths in four years were either in acute mania (233) or acute melancholia (316), or general paralysis (402)—forms of disease that imply cases mostly admitted within the four years' period.

These facts and inferences are submitted to the judgment of those experts who do not find that "occurring insanity" is fast gaining, as I am sure it is here. If any other interpretation can be put upon the figures given, nobody will be more pleased than the writer; but that seems to me hardly possible.

---

*Alleged Increase of Insanity.** By D. Hack Tuke, F.R.C.P.

I propose in the following article to state succinctly, and I trust fairly, the arguments and facts on the affirmative and negative sides of this question, confining myself to England and Wales, and endeavouring to determine on which side the greater weight of evidence lies.

Attention to this vitally important subject was drawn afresh in the early part of the year by Mr. Corbet in a forcible article in the "Fortnightly Review." The following pages are not, however, written for the purpose of controverting the conclusions at which he arrived.

Those who maintain that insanity is on the increase point out:—

That during the 20 years † succeeding 1870 the number of

* Paper read at the Psychology Section of the B. M. A., held at Newcastle, July, 1893.

† There are statistical reasons why, as regards England and Wales, the inquiry should not extend further back than 1870.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

insane recognized by the Commissioners in Lunacy has risen enormously, not only absolutely, but after allowing for increase of population. As a consequence, during these years a large number of asylums have been opened, including the Metropolitan District Asylums, Banstead, Cane Hill, Whittingham, Wadsley, Menston, the Cheshire Asylum (Parkside), the Holloway Sanatorium, and quite recently Claybury. On the other hand, the number of asylums closed consists mainly of small private institutions, leaving a balance of increased building accommodation for at least 20,000. And all this apart from the enlargement of existing asylums, by which a large number of beds have been provided.

2 That the annual *admissions* of lunatics into asylums during the same period have also greatly risen, and that the increase of patients in asylums can no longer be accounted for on grounds given fairly enough some years ago, such as the accumulation arising from a greatly lower death-rate; the greater recognition of insanity with the public and even medical men; or, again, the quickened sense of the necessity of making proper provision for this class.

It is contended that potent as these causes may once have been, they have now lost their force; in short, that a comparison of statistics of 1890 and 1870 is not affected by considerations, which, no donbt, must be regarded when the comparison lies between 1870 and a number of years before —say 1850.

3 That the acknowledged causes of insanity have increased in power and frequency during recent years, and that consequently the number of the insane must have increased also, whatever statistics may say to the contrary; in fact, that insanity ought to have increased if it has not.

4 That some superintendents of asylums are convinced that a lower type of mental disease has developed in recent years, a degeneration indicated by a large increase in the proportion of general paralytics. Thus Mr. Rooke Ley (Prestwich Asylum), in reply to an inquiry, writes:—

"It is a fact patent to everyone connected with our Lancashire institutions that in the manufacturing districts of the county general paralysis has increased in frequency to a notable extent during the last 20 years. A generation ago the disease was rare among females; now it is common enough." And yet I should add that Mr. Ley believes that "the slight increase in all forms of insanity in Lancashire

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

out of proportion to the population is mainly due to the fact that more use is now made of the asylums than formerly was the case."

That many patients are taken out of the asylums by their friends before they are well, and, no doubt, do what they can to increase the population. Dr. Claye Shaw writes to me that for this reason insanity is bound to increase, and he considers that the mischievous clause in the new Lunacy Act, which requires re-certification, leads to patients being discharged who are only convalescent, and brings about the above-mentioned evil. Yet Dr. Claye Shaw concludes by saying: "As far as we can judge from statistics an actual increase of lunacy beyond the rate of increase of population has not been proved."

Those who deny the alleged increase in insanity in England and Wales contend:—

That to compare the mere number of the insane of the present day with the number existing 20 years ago is altogether fallacious.

That so long as the discharges and deaths of patients from asylums are fewer than the admissions there must be, more or less, accumulation of chronic cases.

That the rate of mortality in asylums has not been, as alleged, stationary, but is distinctly lower than it was 20 years ago. Writing in 1889 Mr. Noel Humphreys, than whom there can be no higher authority, observes: "It is beyond question that the rate of mortality in asylums has declined."

That the recognition of insanity has progressively increased during even the last 20 years. That while it is true that some of the causes of insanity have multiplied and intensified in recent years, these are, to a certain extent, counterbalanced by conditions more favourable to mental health than obtained some years ago.

That there has been always a large mass of insane persons and idiots outside the range of registered lunacy, and that there has been, and still is, greater accuracy in registration, the necessary effect of which is to lessen the *reserve* lunacy and to increase the *registered* lunacy, and, therefore, to cause an apparent but not real increase of insanity. At the first census containing a return of the insane in England and Wales, viz., that of 1871, the returns amounted to 69,019 insane or idiots, being 12,264 in excess of those known to

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Commissioners in Lunacy, or nearly 18 per cent. of the total number in England and Wales; whereas in the course of 10 years the disproportion declined to 13 per cent. Again, in the last census (1891) the number of insane stands at 97,383, while the number recognized by the Lunacy Commissioners at the same date was 89,822, a difference of 7,561, or 7 per cent., the disproportion being still further reduced. This is due, in the opinion of Mr. Noel Humphreys, to the more complete registration of certified cases, and the consequent reduction of the unregistered cases. This he points out is confirmed by the fact that the rate of increase in the returns of the Commissioners is a declining one.

6 Again, those who deny that there is an increased liability to insanity point to the fact that the apparent increase has taken place among pauper lunatics. It is maintained that if advancing civilization and culture cause a larger proportion of insane persons to the population a greater number of the educated classes should become insane, not the poor and uneducated. Thus I find that during the five years 1888-92 the rise in the number of admissions of private patients into asylums in England and Wales has been at the rate of only 1 per cent., while the rise in the admissions of pauper patients into asylums has been at the rate of 12·5 per cent.

7 That there has been a very large exodus of patients from workhouses and the care of relatives to county asylums since 1870. Asylum superintendents are constantly remarking in their annual reports on this large relative proportion of workhouse cases during recent years. In 1885 24 per cent. of pauper lunatics were in workhouses, 9 per cent. with relatives and others, and 67 per cent. in asylums; whereas in 1892 21 per cent. were in workhouses, 7 per cent. were with relatives, while there were no less than 72 per cent. in asylums. It is most important to remember that this change in the distribution of pauper lunatics accounts for many admissions into asylums, and are not returned under the head of "transfers" by the Commissioners in Lunacy. The Commissioners in their 39th Report (1885), in commenting upon the ratio of admissions into asylums to the population, observe that the advance which has taken place during the previous year was due to local and exceptional conditions, particularly the admissions into the Lancashire asylums of an unusually large number of imbeciles long resident in workhouses, and, therefore, not fresh cases of insanity. The excess in the admissions due to this cause having been eliminated it was found

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the rate of fresh cases in 1883 came down to about the proportion which has prevailed since 1875. These figures, they add, tend to support the conclusion that "the large annual addition to the number of insane under care is almost entirely due to accumulation of chronic cases of the pauper class, so that the community at large would not appear more liable than formerly to an attack of insanity."

Lastly, the age-distribution of the insane as shown by the census is regarded as favouring the opinion that the apparent increase of insanity is due to "accumulation."

Having stated some, but not all, of the facts adduced in support of the rival opinions held in regard to the increase of insanity in this country, I proceed to give the statistics with which it is necessary to grapple before attempting to arrive at a conclusion on the question.

Let us first take the number of *certified* lunatics and idiots in asylums or in single charge in England and Wales during the years succeeding 1870, and ascertain the ratio of increase of the insane to the population.

In 1871 (January 1st) the total number amounted to 37,266, being a proportion of 16·35 to 10,000 of the estimated population, while on January 1st, 1893, the number had risen to 67,235, a proportion of 22·61 to the same number of the population. It is, however, fairer to take an average of the first five years of the period and compare it with the last quinquennium. Omitting decimals, we find 16 per 10,000 for the former, and 21 per 10,000 for the latter, being a rise of 31 per cent. in the number of certified lunatics in asylums during the term. In other words, to every 100 lunatics during the first quinquennium there were 131 in the last, allowing for increase of population (Table I.).

This has, no doubt, the appearance of a very alarming increase of mental disorder in England. But taken by themselves these figures prove nothing of the kind. They might be as large, without there having been any increase whatever in the liability to become insane. The various explanations already enumerated by those who deny this increased liability may fairly be applied to any enumeration of the number of the insane existing now, as compared with a former period. We may at once show how the single circumstance of the greater tendency to send patients to asylums, both on the part of their friends and on the part of guardians, may account for a large amount of this rise in

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the number of certified lunatics. For this purpose we take the total number of lunatics in England and Wales, that is to say, not only in asylums, but in workhouses, and those institutions in the "Metropolitan District" which are placed in the same legal category. Now, making a similar comparison to that which we have made in the enumeration of certified lunatics, we find that during the first quinquennium after 1870, the proportion of the insane to 10,000 of the population averaged 25, while during the last five years it averaged fully 29, showing a rate of increase in the two periods of 16 per cent. (Table II.). No one who understands the bearing of these figures will deny that the difference between this percentage and the former one (31 per cent.) merely indicates the shifting of a mass of uncertified lunatics to asylums in which they are certified under the Lunacy Act. But it will be said there still remains the increase of 16 per cent. to explain away. Although it is difficult, and, indeed, impossible, to assign a numerical value to each proffered explanation, I hold that it is quite probable that most, if not all, of the 16 per cent. increase may be accounted for by the circumstances already mentioned, other than the transference of patients from workhouses to asylums.

One very important circumstance is the misleading effect of readmissions in swelling the population of our asylums. It is clear that had there been no relapses since 1870 (these clearly not being any indication or evidence of an increase of insanity) the number in asylums at the present time would be much fewer than it is. In fact, I find that instead of the number of certified lunatics in detention on January 1st, 1893, being 67,235, the number would really have been 61,105, if there had been no readmissions—a difference of 6,030.

Further, let us put the result of the lower death-rate to the test by calculating what has actually been its numerical effect in asylums since 1870. The death-rate in and for some years prior to 1870, calculated on the mean number resident, may be taken at 10·34 per cent. This rate might have been continued unaltered from that year to, say, 1890—twenty years after. But it did not, and the consequence was that 5,624 more patients were living than would have survived had the former death-rate been maintained. The significance of this may be forcibly shown by the fact that this is almost exactly the number of patients (5,699) in the Metropolitan District Asylums on January 1st,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1890; these asylums having been erected in 1870. Obviously, had the number of deaths occurred which would have taken place at the old rate, there would have been room in asylums for as many more admissions as would fill their places.

Then there is the explanation based on the effect of accumulation; one, however, which is merely begging the question as frequently used, for it is clear, on a moment's reflection, that an actual increase of insanity would itself cause accumulation. But the effect of accumulation in the following illustration is not due to this cause. Take, as an example, the Borough Asylum of Newcastle-on-Tyne from its opening in 1865 to the end of 1890. Assume that the annual admissions *had been exactly the same every year*, and, for convenience sake, say 100. On this number let us calculate the discharges and deaths *at the rate that actually occurred*. The patients who remain out of the admissions of the last two years cannot properly be regarded as belonging to the class of accumulated cases; but those remaining of any prior year's admissions may be fairly regarded as cases not likely to be discharged, except by death. Well, this number amounts to 302, or 12 per cent. of the admissions during the years named. Of the number remaining at the end of 1890 on this scheme, viz., 427, the accumulated cases are 70 per cent. Now, as a matter of fact, the number of patients resident in the Newcastle Asylum, at the end of 1890, was 400. Treating the figures on the same principle, we find that no fewer than 270 represent the accumulated cases in the asylum at that date, being about the same percentage as that given hypothetically, due to what I may call the accumulation of chronicity. It is an instructive fact that of these 270 patients one quarter of the first year's admissions (29) were still living in the asylum at the close of 1890.

The fallacies which thus confessedly attach to all returns of existing insanity can only be avoided by ascertaining the relative amount of *occurring* insanity at the different periods under review, but this, unhappily, we are unable to ascertain with the necessary degree of accuracy. Some years ago I prepared a table showing the admissions of patients into asylums labouring under *first* attacks of insanity, but I am unable to supply this information during the term of years we are now considering, because the Lunacy Blue Books did not make these returns so long ago as 1870, and because

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I have now reason to believe that the returns which have been since published cannot be trusted. This is greatly to be regretted, because the very thing we want to arrive at in this inquiry is the number of fresh cases occurring year by year. The nearest approach to this knowledge is the *admissions* of patients during the first and last quinquennial periods of the years succeeding 1870, *minus* transfers and readmissions, that is to say, *first admissions.* It must, however, be borne in mind that this expression does not mean that the patient was admitted for the first time into any asylum whatever, but merely into the asylum in regard to which the return is made. He might have been in several institutions before and recovered. Again, it is a most unfortunate circumstance that these returns do not include admissions into workhouses or the number who have become for the first time outdoor insane paupers. The returns of first admissions apply, therefore, exclusively to lunatics certified under the Lunacy Act.

Taking these returns for what they are worth as the nearest approximation to the amount of occurring insanity, we find the proportion to be 4 per 10,000 of the population during the first five years (1871-5 inclusive) and nearly 5 per 10,000 during the last (1888-92 inclusive); this being a rise at the rate of 14 per cent. There can be no doubt that this figure is a better test of the alleged increase of insanity than the percentages already given, calculated on the number in detention at the corresponding periods, whether in asylums only or in asylums and workhouses (Table III).

In explaining the rise in admissions into asylums, it is obvious that the same reason which was given for the increase in the number of patients under asylum care fairly applies here, that is to say, there has been a larger proportion of patients sent to asylums than to workhouses. I think there is great force in the observations made by the Lunacy Commissioners in their Report of 1893, that "the confidence which the public has learnt to place in the management of asylums has no doubt conduced to the placing in them of many persons above the status of paupers, their relatives reimbursing the Guardians the cost of their maintenance."

One aspect of this question, and a very important one, is the *age-distribution* of the insane. In a paper read before

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Royal Statistical Society of London in 1890 Mr. Noel Humphreys drew attention to its bearing on the alleged increase of insanity in a very able manner. Since the last Census was issued the subject has been treated on the same lines in the "British Medical Journal."* What the Census return showed is this: that at all ages under 45 the number of insane was less in 1881 than in 1871, and in 1891 than in 1881. Thus, of 1,000 insane persons of all ages, 594 were in 1871 under 45 years of age, and in 1881 the corresponding number was 571, while in 1891 the number was as low as 545.

Concurrently, at all ages above 45 the proportion was higher in 1881 than in 1871, and higher in 1891 than in 1881. Thus of 1,000 insane persons living at the time of the first Census 406 were above the age of 45, at the second Census the number was 429, and at the last Census the number had risen to 455. This is attributed, I think fairly, to the effect of accumulation. The proportion of the insane to the population at certain age-periods is important, for, as pointed out, the declining birth-rate in this country causes a considerable change in the proportional age distribution of the general population. Without entering into details, it may be stated that there was a marked decline in the ratio of the insane to the general population in England and Wales under 25 years, while between that age and 45 the increase was very small. All asylum statistics show, as might be expected, a great liability to insanity during these twenty-five years of man's life, and assuming, as we are bound to do, unless disproved, that Mr. Humphreys' statistics are reliable, the evidence adduced in favour of a large increase of occurring insanity is greatly weakened. Taking all ages under 45 it appears that the ratio of the insane to the population was in 1871, 2·24 per 1,000; in 1881, 2·29; and in 1891, 2·26; showing that there was practically no increase in the ratio between the 20 years, 1871-91. When, however, the ratio of the insane to the population *above* 45 years is taken, a very different state of things is exhibited, for in 1871 the ratio was 6·35, in 1881 it was 7·40, while in 1891 it was as high as 8·02.† Hence the inference appears

* September 2nd and 9th, 1893.

† Dr. Rayner, in a paper on "The Alleged Increase of Insanity," contributed to the "British Medical Journal," since the reading of this paper at Newcastle, has endorsed the opinion that the increase of insanity is only an

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to be allowable that as the increased ratio between 1871 and 1891 is traced to the period of life above 45, the principal cause, at any rate, is the accumulation of chronic cases.

The explanation offered to account for the alleged increase of insanity, namely, that as many cases have under the influence of the Capitation Grant been sent to asylums instead of to workhouses a vast number who would not have been labelled "insane" in the latter would, of course, when placed in an asylum be returned as lunatics, and swell the numbers registered by the Commissioners in Lunacy, has certainly great force.

It is observed in the "General Report of the Census" (1891), issued at the close of 1893 by the Registrar-General and the Statistical Superintendent (Dr. W. Ogle), the ratio of *recoveries* must be taken into account as well as the death-rate. The two combined constitute the discharge rate. This averaged 19 per cent. annually from 1871-80, while it was only 17·8 during the years 1881-90. It is maintained that these figures suffice to account for the increase in living lunatics. "With an annual discharge-rate of 19 per cent. of lunatics living at the beginning of the year, it would require an addition each year of 6,889 fresh cases per million population, spread evenly over the year, to raise the ratios of living lunatics from 3,034 per million, as it was in 1871, to 3,253 per million, as it was in 1881; but to raise the ratio from this level of 3,253 to 3,358, ten years later, as it stood in 1891, would require, with a discharge-rate of 17·83 per cent., an annual addition of only 661 new cases per million population. The returns, then, if correct, or if equally incorrect, on the two successive decennia, so far from showing that lunacy, as measured by the proportion of new cases annually occurring in the population, is on the increase, show the contrary, and lead to the conclusion that there has been a slight decline. For the average annual new cases in 1871-81 must have been 689 per million persons

apparent one. "Personal experience and the Annual Reports of the Asylum Superintendents confirm the opinion that the undoubted increase of senile admissions is due rather to the increased certifications of dotards and paralyzed persons not previously classed as insane than to increase of disease." It may be added that his ultimate conclusion is "that the evidence at present available admits of the interpretation that there is no real excess in the amount of occurring insanity, but is ever compatible with the possibility of an absolute diminution."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

living, or one fresh case of insanity yearly, to 1,451 persons, while in 1881-91 the proportion must have been only 661, or one fresh case of insanity each year to 1,513 persons."

It is, of course, assumed that the discharge-rate among all lunatics has been the same as among those falling under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners. Whether so or not the error would not be very important, seeing that the latter constitutes 90 per cent. of the total number.

The medical superintendent of the Middlesex County Asylum at Wandsworth (Dr. Gardiner Hill), in his Report for 1892, in speaking of the number of Middlesex cases requiring asylum treatment, observes: "The increase is probably more apparent than real, and does not correctly determine the increased proportion of insane to the sane in the county of Middlesex. For in addition to the growth of the population of the county, there are other points that must be inquired into in solving the vexed question, 'Is insanity on the increase?' For instance, accumulation in the asylum has been taking place owing to a low death-rate (the average for the last four years is 7·6 on the average number resident), and to the fact that more senile, idiot, and paralyzed cases are now admitted than formerly, when, on account of the insufficiency of accommodation in the old Middlesex Asylums, these cases were kept at home or in the Unions."

Mr. Whitcombe, in his Report of the Birmingham City Asylum for 1892, observes: "If the statistics of this asylum be carefully noted it will be observed that the admissions, the numbers remaining at the end of each year, and the average resident population have steadily increased since the asylum was opened. This increase appears to be the normal one from increase of population and accumulation of chronic cases, and does not, I believe, point to any alarming increase in the ratio to population of new cases."

In conclusion I may summarize the principal points elicited by this inquiry as follows:—

There has undoubtedly been since 1870 a large increase in the number of patients in asylums and workhouses, but proportionately more in the former than in the latter.

There has not been so great, but still a considerable rise, in the *admissions* of patients into asylums during

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same periods, after deducting transfers and readmissions.

The advance in the number in detention, although it holds good after allowing for the increase in population, does not prove the increased liability of the community to insanity, seeing the vast accumulation due to a lower death-rate (even since 1870), the chronicity of the disease, and the lamentable tendency to relapse.

The advance in admissions again does not prove increased liability to insanity, as (*a*) the value and comfort of asylums are increasingly appreciated, (*b*) there has been a very large number of patients drafted from workhouses to asylums, and (*c*) there has been an ever-increasing encroachment on the mass of unregistered lunacy which the Census shows to exist.

The increase in the number of the insane has taken place among the poorer classes of society.

The increase in the ratio of the insane during the twenty years between 1871 and 1891 has taken place in persons above the age of 45, the significance of which lies in the accumulation of chronic cases. On the other hand, there has been a decline during this period in the proportion of cases of mental weakness under 25 years of age to the population at the same term of life—a most important circumstance.

The age-distribution of the insane favours, therefore, the conclusion that the increase of insanity is apparent rather than real, being mainly due to accumulation.

That, considerable as has been the increase in the number of the insane as returned in the censuses of 1871, 1881, and 1891, the ratio of increase has been a declining one, for although the rise in the ratio to the population was 7·04 per cent. during the decade 1871-81, it was only 3·23 per cent. in that of 1881-91.

If these results are on the whole reassuring, they are, it must be admitted, nothing to boast of. I say nothing to boast of, because twenty years of social progress and the advance of medical knowledge ought to have materially lessened the proportion of the insane to the population. The lesson to carry away from a study of the foregoing statistics is not one of congratulation, but the necessity for making more earnest and definite attempts to diminish the causes of insanity, and to discourage, by every possible

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

means, the extension of the disease by the marriage of individuals of insane stock or who have been themselves deranged in mind, impracticable as I believe it to be to obtain this object by legislation.

In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper Dr. J. A. Campbell (Garlands Asylum) laid great stress upon the effect of the 4s. Capitation Grant given in 1874 to patients in pauper asylums, but withheld from lunatics in workhouses. To this he attributed much of the apparent increase of insanity during the last twenty years, quoting Dr. Maudsley's statement in 1877 that "the Conservative Government had practically offered a premium to parochial authorities for every patient they could, by hook or crook, send into asylums," and adding that his forecast that the number of pauper lunatics would apparently vastly increase had been verified. Dr. Campbell also adduced the fact that senile cases (dotage) were now sent in much larger numbers to asylums. At the Carlisle Asylum 2 per cent. of the admissions during the decade ending 1872 were above 70 years of age; 4 per cent. during the next decade; and 6 per. cent. during the decade ending 1892. Again, Cumberland was flooded at times by uneducated Irishmen unaccustomed to high wages, who had not the sense to use their money wisely. In the same discussion Dr. Howden (supported by Dr. Yellowlees) attributed part of the apparent increase of insanity to the change which had taken place in the nature of employment of the working classes. Half a century ago hand-loom weaving and small farms or crops permitted the relatives to attend to their weak-minded relatives while pursuing their occupations at home, whereas, when they had to work at spinning mills, or as servants on large farms, they were compelled to send the insane or imbecile members of their families to asylums. This change, he added, was still going on. Although the speaker referred to Scotland, his remarks applied to some extent to England and Wales. Dr. Merson maintained that the increase in the admission rate was fully accounted for by the operation of the Lunacy Laws, the energetic action on the part of the authorities, and the accumulation of chronic cases in asylums. ("Journal Mental Science," October 25th, 1893.)

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE I.—Showing the Number of Certified Lunatics and Idiots in Lunatic Asylums or Confined as Single Patients in England and Wales, during each of the 23 years 1871-93, and the Rate of Increase, allowing for increase of Population.

Year.	Total Number of Certified Lunatics on 1st January.	Proportion to 10,000 of the Estimated Population.	Proportion per 10,000 of the Population in various groups of years.	Rate of increase in last over first quinquennium (per cent.).
1871	37,266	16·357		
1872	37,592	16·296		
1873	38,883	16·220	16·698	
1874	40,170	16·986		
1875	41,558	17·355		
1876	42,880	17·687		
1877	44,286	17·930		
1878	46,059	18·399	18·342	
1879	47,650	18·781		
1880	48,747	18·957		
1881	50,173	19·252		
1882	51,753	19·593		31·6
1883	53,180	19·865	19·921	
1884	55,072	20·297		
1885	56,525	20·555		
1886	57,090	20·743		
1887	57,701	20·735		
1888	59,181	20·977	21·119*	
1889	60,901	21·407		
1890	62,431	21·706		
1891	63,992	22·004	21·985	
1892	65,244	22·189		
1893	67,235	22·618		

* Taking 20 years only, the rate of increase in last over first quinquennium was 26·4 per cent.

Corresponds with Table V page 16 in Commissr's Report for 1893

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE II.—Showing the Total Number of Lunatics and Idiots in England and Wales on Jan. 1st, 1871, and subsequent years, and the Rate of Increase, after allowing for Increase of Population.

Year.	Total Number of Lunatics on 1st Jan.	Proportion to 10,000 of the Estimated Population.	Proportion per 10,000 of the Population in various groups of years.	Rate of increase in last over first quinquennium (per cent.).
1871	56,755	24·911		
1872	58,640	25·421		
1873	60,296	25·815	25·756	
1874	62,027	26·229		
1875	63,793	26·642		
1876	64,916	26·776		
1877	66,636	26·979		
1878	68,538	27·379	27·252	
1879	69,885	27·545		
1880	71,191	27·685		
1881	73,113	28·071		
1882	74,842	28·419		16·23
1883	76,765	28·830	28·738	
1884	78,528	29·089		
1885	79,704	29·281		
1886	80,156	29·125		
1887	80,891	29·069		
1888	82,643	29·293	29·412	
1889	84,340	29·648		
1890	86,067	29·924		
1891	86,795	29·846	29·973	
1892	87,848	29·877		
1893	89,822	30·210		

Corresponds with Table II. page 10. of Commissioners Report for 1893

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.169.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE III.—Showing the Admissions of Certified Lunatics and Idiots, *less Transfers* and Readmissions*, into Asylums and Single Houses in England and Wales during each of the 22 years 1871-92, and the Rate of Increase, after allowing for increase of Population

Year.	Admissions of Certified Lunatics, *less* Transfers and Re admissions.	Proportion per 10,000 of the Estimated Population.	Proportion per 10,000 of the Population in various groups of years.	Rate of increase in last over first quinquennium (per cent.).
1871	9,267	4·067		
1872	9,412	4·075		
1873	9,942	4·247	4·294	
1874	10,619	4·476		
1875	11,023	4·585		
1876	11,404	4·680		
1877	11,428	4·627		
1878	11,844	4·731	4·613	
1879	11,480	4·525		
1880	11,596	4·570		
1881	11,821	4·538		
1882	11,871	4·508		14·2
1883	12,767	4·795	4·456	
1884	12,539	4·645		
1885	11,578	4·253		
1886	11,765	4·275		
1887	12,362	4·442		
1888	12,937	4·586	4·596	
1889	13,318	4·682		
1890	14,360	4·993	4·905	
1891	14,764	5·077		
1892	15,051	5·118		

* Exclusive of removals from Workhouses to Asylums, which are not given in the Blue Books (see back pp. 222 and 226).