me that the patient had been trustee for some orphans, that he had for many years been appropriating the funds to himself, and that when the time arrived when he knew that the crash must come he broke down, being perfectly unable to meet the shock, took to his bed, and fell into despair. He had been guilty of gross frauds, and every word he said about his own wickedness was correct, and it was only too true that at any moment the police might have entered his house and carried him off to gaol, where he would have spent his remaining years in infamy. To save this disgrace an arrangement was made to refund the purloined money as far as possible, and when this was settled he left his bed, and lived nearly three years afterwards. If drawing a conclusion from premises which turn out to be false does not show the most judicious state of mind, then the supposed mad patient exercised a better reason than his doctors.

OCCASIONAL NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

County Boards and County Asylums.

We have had a series of newspaper cuttings supplied to us which afford a striking commentary upon the question of County Boards in their relation to County Asylums.

If, as seems probable, a County Boards Bill should be introduced by the Government and become law, and the constitution of these Boards be such as it probably would be, County Asylums being brought under their jurisdiction, the first blow will have been struck at the prosperity of the County Asylum system, which now reflects so much credit upon the humanitarian spirit and organizing capacity of the educated class in this country.

The ordinary guardian of the poor is too often only a guardian of the rates, whose instinct is the keeping down, at all cost, of present expense. He seems to have no foresight except in so far as it leads him to look to the future to make its own provision for its own charges. There is, indeed, too much evidence that this is so. Before the Government grant of four shillings a head for patients in asylums was provided, there was constant complaint that the recovery of patients was interfered with, and the ranks of permanent pauper lunacy swelled, by the detention in

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

workhouses, at a reduced rate of maintenance, of patients in acute states of insanity, whose cases could only be properly and efficiently treated in asylums. Now that the grant has been made, the complaint, as is shown by the recent report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, has changed its direction, and is to the effect that everywhere patients who might be properly maintained in workhouses, with a little present expenditure in extra diet and better accommodation, are sent to the County Asylums because of the grant from the Consolidated Fund. This comes equally out of the pockets of the ratepayers, but it has a general and not a local source, and so the pressure of its incidence is unnoticed and unfelt.

The Committees of County Asylums throughout the country at present consist generally of gentlemen of education and position, who have both a large personal interest in securing an economical administration of county finance, and an enlarged appreciation of what constitutes true economy.

They know that present parsimony in certain directions implies a large necessary expenditure in the future, and all experience goes to prove that this is so in an especial degree with reference to the care of the insane.

In their accommodation and treatment what may be called the fringe of expenditure is especially valuable. The decoration of rooms and the provision of suitable amusements undoubtedly have a deep moral influence in the cure of insanity. But they are not absolutely necessary, and is it to be supposed from what is seen and known of the typical guardian that he will be willing to continue an expenditure in respect of them when he is unable accurately to weigh or measure the advantage to his pocket which is derived from them?

So also with reference to the salaries and pensions of the superior officers. The present Committees, with some few unfortunate exceptions, know that ability and efficiency are commodities which possess a money value, and are deserving, even from a selfish standpoint, of recognition at the hands of those who use and profit by them.

Will this be so by those who, adopting trade union principles, place every one upon a common platform of so much work, so much pay, irrespective altogether of the quality of the work or the ability of the worker?

The experience of a large number of Boards of Guardians shows us clearly that the most frequent form of estimating the value of a man's services is comprised in the usual

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expression, "We can get plenty of men to do the work for less money; why give a larger salary?" Apply this to the superintendent of an asylum, and it requires no stretch of imagination to foresee what the result must inevitably be. If ability has its money value, unless the money is forthcoming men of ability will gradually cease to enter the service.

Asylum life, whatever its outward aspects may be, is especially trying, as the framers of the law have affirmed by shortening the term of service necessary for the earning of a pension under ordinary circumstances, and it needs the inducements which are offered in a liberal salary and a subsequent pension to secure from the best men the devotion of the best years of their lives to such a service.

Will County Boards be likely to recognise these claims and continue these inducements?

Let us see what action has been recently taken in a western county by men who are clamouring for the establishment of County Boards, and, we suppose, are such as will largely constitute them.

It appears that the Superintendent of the Gloucester County Asylum, after nineteen years' service, has resigned his appointment from ill-health, and that the Committee of Visitors, after careful consideration of his claims, have recommended to Quarter Sessions that he should receive a pension of £550, equal to the amount of half his salary, not reckoning allowances.

This recommendation would seem to have excited, in a remarkable degree, the rate-saving instinct of the guardian class, and one Board after another has passed resolutions condemnatory, some of the specific amount, and others of the pension system altogether, in a manner which augurs ill for the future claimants of pensions under the reign of a County Boards Bill.

The following letter to the Gloucester newspapers, by Mr. W. Priday, Chairman of the Gloucester Highway Board, Brockworth Court, dated Oct. 10, 1882, gives the views which are typical of this class:—

"The resolutions passed by the Westbury-on-Severn and Cheltenham Boards of Guardians (and the consideration of the question by the Gloucester Board to-day), condemnatory of the action of the Visiting Justices in voting a retiring pension of £550 to Mr. Toller, will be endorsed by every true

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

local taxation reformer in the county. As far as possible I would avoid introducing the name of that gentleman into the controversy, as it is with reference to the general system rather than to this individual case that I wish principally to refer. It appears to me that the time has come when a direct stand must be made against these extravagances, and one would have thought that with agriculture, figuratively speaking, down and bleeding at every pore, the County Authority would in this case have held their hand.

"I never could understand why officers of public bodies (in many cases already overpaid) are more entitled to or should be led to expect a pension upon their retirement any more than the trustworthy or toiling clerk in many private establishments. It is true the law says these pensions may be—mark you, not shall be—granted, and the only answer would seem to be that collectively men are more inclined to be liberal with public monies than individually they are with their own. County Lunatic Asylums, rightly considered, are in no sense local liabilities any more than the army or navy themselves, and if the Imperial Government, by the law, is anxious to perpetuate, not to say encourage, such wasteful expenditure, by all means let such institutions be taken over, and supported from the national funds, in which case these requisitions would be made upon the many, and not, as now, extracted from the pockets of the few; but even taking the law as it stands, does any one for a moment suppose that under a representative County Board this grant would have been voted?

"I answer emphatically, No. There are those who argue that, were this system established, the expenditure would be as great as now, and who are inclined to say with Hamlet that 'it is better to endure the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of.' For my part I feel no apprehension, but, on the contrary, am firmly convinced that greater economy would be practised. There are other appointments with the salaries thereto attached besides the one to which this letter chiefly alludes, such as the Clerkship of the Peace, the County Treasurership, and others, which would be considerably overhauled at the hands of a County Board. Without wishing to disparage those who through birth, territorial possessions, or social standing happen to belong to the County Authority, it is nevertheless a fact that the management of County Finance and County Government by a body of gentlemen appointed by

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Crown is a relic of the past, is contradictory to the principle of representative government, and is day by day becoming more distasteful to the ratepayers.

"The Court of Quarter Sessions have yet a loophole out of this difficulty. They may wisely refuse to sanction the proposal of the Visiting Justices, and by so doing will earn the gratitude of the ratepayers, and would be showing deference to public opinion, which is everywhere being so strongly expressed against so large a grant."

In the report of a meeting of the Gloucester Board of Guardians, the views of those who compose it are given as follows:—

THE SUPERANNUATION OF MR. TOLLER.

The CHAIRMAN said that at the last meeting Mr. Lawrence gave notice of the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this Board the amount of superannuation recommended by the Visiting Justices of the Gloucester County Lunatic Asylum to the late superintendent, Mr. Toller, is excessive, and that a memorial from this Board be forwarded to the Court of Quarter Sessions, suggesting a reduction in the proposed superannuation allowance."

Mr. LAWRENCE said that taking all circumstances into consideration, and considering the very great depression that existed among agriculturists, from whose pockets the amount for the superannuation would chiefly come, he felt that he was warranted in bringing the motion forward. He was sure that, as a representative of the ratepayers, he should not be doing his duty if he did not use every effort in his power to lessen the burden placed upon the ratepayers' shoulders (applause).

Mr. MURRELL seconded. He considered that during the time that Mr. Toller had executed his duties he had received an ample salary. It was wrong in principle, he considered, that such officers should be paid superannuation, because superannuation to a greater or less extent meant a burden falling on occupiers of land or buildings, and they all knew that the charges on occupiers of land had recently been rapidly increasing year by year (hear, hear).

Mr. DANIEL LONG—What is the length of Mr. Toller's services? (Voices: 19 years).

Mr. LONG said he should not have many remarks to make on this subject, as he did not understand it enough. It was high time that the county rate should be controlled by representation instead of as at present (hear, hear). The borough rate was controlled by the representatives of the people, but so far as the county rate was concerned the ratepayers were subjected to those who contributed very little towards it. It was high time that the county rate should be levied through the medium of representation (applause).

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Rev. F. E. Broome Witts said he had grave doubts as to whether the Board of Guardians were not overstepping their right in entertaining the matter at all as a Board of Guardians (no, no). As a public body he considered they were quite entitled to express their opinion; he had, however, very grave doubts as to whether the Board were not overstepping their rights as a Board of Guardians in this discussion. The matter was in the hands of another body (no, no). The question as to whether there should be county boards or whether the ratepayers should be governed by magistrates was another matter altogether. As far as the asylum was concerned he thought they simply had power to appoint a committee who should look after the interests of any paupers who might be in that institution. As to how far they had carried out that power of looking after the paupers in the asylum he did not know, but he believed they had been rather lax. He had been told on good authority that of all the unions in the county there was only one union—and he did not think that was the Gloucester Union—which exercised that power. As far as he was concerned he did not entirely concur with Mr. Lawrence. He did not wish in any way to oppose the motion before the Board, but at the same time he did not think all the circumstances of the case were before them as a Board of Guardians. He should have liked Mr. Lawrence to have told them, for instance, what had been done in other counties where superannuations had been made for similar service. He believed the point as to how questions of this sort were decided in other counties was considered by the Asylum Committee, and that they had taken the fairest average they could in recommending Mr. Toller's superannuation. He thought the ratepayers could very well leave their interests in the hands of the present Asylum Committee.

Mr. Inskip said the magistrates would sign the mandate calling on them to pay whatever might be apportioned to come from the Gloucester Union. He thought that alone would give the Board of Guardians the power to remonstrate—or he would not say to remonstrate—to ask the magistrates to exercise caution as to the amount they would grant (hear, hear). He did not think for a moment that the consideration of this question was beyond the scope of the Board's duties. He thought it rather lay within their scope. They should protect the ratepayers as far as they possibly could in every matter affecting their pockets (applause). The ratepayers were looking to them. They were already complaining about the amount of county rate, and there was an agitation going on about county boards. He quite thought it was their duty as well as it was their privilege to ask the magistrates to exercise a due degree of vigilance in the affairs of the county, and to administer affairs with rigid economy, and to consider whether they were not proposing to allow a little larger sum than Mr. Toller would require (hear, hear).

Mr. Long was surprised that Mr. Witts should say that the Board of Guardians had nothing to do with a question which affected the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rates. He contended that they had a perfect right to discuss such a motion as Mr. Lawrence's at the meeting of the Guardians, and elsewhere—at the meeting of the Highway Board for instance (applause).

Mr. SESSIONS thought that though the matter might not be exactly in the Board's province, yet it did belong to them as the representatives of the ratepayers. The superannuation fund would certainly be paid out of the county rates, but they were called upon to pay a portion of those rates, and that being so, he thought they had the power and the right to make a remonstrance, if they chose (hear, hear). If it were not that they had to speak in the matter as the representatives of ratepayers, he should contend that they had nothing to do with it.

Mr. DAINTY remarked that the Board of Guardians had to find some of the money for the superannuation, but had no voice in the deliberation as to the amount of superannuation, beyond sending a memorial expressing their opinions to the proper quarter (hear, hear).

Mr. BYETT suggested that such a memorial should also be sent to the Local Government Board, as although certain superannuation might be voted by magistrates, it might not be confirmed by the Local Government Board. Mr Byett was told, however, that the Local Government Board had nothing to do with the matter.

Mr WARD, looking at the circumstances all round, he thought the superannuation proposed was excessive (hear, hear). When Mr. Toller was appointed there were a number of applicants for the position, and he accepted with pleasure a salary of £500 a year. Since that time the salary had increased to £1,150. The duties had not increased, however, in proportion to the increase of salary (applause). There was one assistant when Mr. Toller took the post. Since there had been an increase in the number of inmates there had been another assistant, and therefore the duties remained something like they were when Mr. Toller was first appointed, while the salary had so largely increased. Was it reasonable for a man to have a superannuation greater than the salary which he received when first appointed? It seemed to him most monstrous. It was unfair to the ratepayers of the union, and unfair to the county, that this superannuation should be allowed (hear, hear). It was at the cost of the hard-working people, not of those who apportioned the amount, that it would be paid. It would come out of the industry of the hard-working community (hear, hear). If the land could not be made worth anything, the money would not be paid at all. Therefore, as a ratepayer, he objected to the payment on principle. It seemed monstrous that a man should receive £550 as superannuation on retiring from a post which he was glad to accept at £500 (applause).

The CHAIRMAN quite agreed with Mr. Lawrence's resolution, and was very pleased that the discussion had taken a proper form that morning. Mr. Broome Witts had been perfectly right. It was a little foreign to their duties to discuss this motion, but still it was

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the only chance they had of expressing an opinion, and therefore he thought the discussion was quite in order (hear, hear). He, for one, entirely disagreed with the superannuation principle altogether (applause). What he would like to do was to pay everybody properly and let them superannuate themselves (hear, hear). He thought they must give the magistrates credit for having endeavoured to do everything they could not to increase the ratepayers' expenses at the present time. (A voice : I don't know, sir.) They were not increasing expenses at the present time, but what he found fault with them for was not taking advantage of a very good opportunity for a little decrease (applause). If they had agreed upon a smaller amount for superannuation there would have been a slight decrease. At present there was no increase because the gentleman appointed to take Mr. Toller's place would receive £750. The superannuation of Dr. Williams (a former superintendent, who rceived £300 a year) had ceased, and altogether there had been no increase. He thought, however, that where a gentleman had been receiving £1,150 (including a house) for performing duties which another gentleman was appointed to undertake at £750, there had been ample opportunity for the former gentleman to have superannuated himself (applause).

The resolution was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously. A copy of the resolution will be sent to the Court of Quarter Sessions.

The moral of all this would seem to be that whenever the Guardian class comes into power with a mission to control county finance, the doctrines inculcated by the writer and speakers in the above extracts will have a practical application whenever and wherever the salary of a new superintendent, or the pension of a retiring one, have to be considered ; and that it, therefore, behoves the Parliamentary Committee of our Association to narrowly watch the terms and course of whatever County Boards Bill may be introduced, and the members of our specialty to render them such assistance as is within their power.

Since the above was written a Conference took place on November 18th, in the Shire Hall, Gloucester, between the Visiting Committee of County Justices to the County Asylum and delegates from various Boards of Guardians and other authorities in the county, with regard to the proposed grant of a pension of £550 per annum to Mr. Toller.

That the Guardian voice should be allowed to make itself heard in this question is an entirely new departure in the history of the management of pauper asylums, which have hitherto been under the control of county justices who have

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

usually been undeterred and uninfluenced by popular clamour, and it is significant of the serious and impending danger to the best interests of the insane poor and the staffs of asylums when these are placed under the jurisdiction of County Boards.

We think it desirable to place on permanent record the following very important discussion (slightly abridged), that took place at the said Conference, which was attended by some 14 members of the Committee of Visiting Justices, including Mr. J. E. Dorington, County Chairman, and Dr. Ancrum, Chairman of the Asylum Committee, and between 30 and 40 members of Boards of Guardians, generally represented by Chairman or Vice-Chairman.

Special attention is drawn to the speeches of Mr. J. E. Dorington, County Chairman, and Dr. Ancrum, the Asylum Chairman, in which they make a reasonable, just, and able defence of the principle of superannuation, for which they deserve the warmest thanks of asylum officers generally, as well as an able defence of the action of the Asylum Committee with regard to the particular matter in question.

Attention is also drawn to the speech of Mrs. McIlquham, representative of the Tewkesbury Board of Guardians, as showing the spirit in which this lady Guardian would be likely to deal with asylum officers, if she had a voice in the management and became a member of the County Board Asylum Committee as representing the Tewkesbury Guardians.

This is another new departure from the old order of things, not to be contemplated without some misgiving, if, as seems probable, lady Guardians will be eligible for election in County Board Committees as representatives of Boards of Guardians.

The concluding portion of this discussion is very significant, for Mr. J. Ward, one of the representatives of the Gloucester Board of Guardians says, "The opinion generally of the ratepayers is that there should be no pensions whatever."

We are indebted for the report of the Conference to the "Gloucester Journal," Nov. 25, 1882.

On Saturday last (Nov. 18), a Conference took place between the Visiting Committee of the County Justices to the county asylum and delegates from various Boards of Guardians and other authorities in the county, with regard to the proposed grant of a pension of £550 per annum to Mr. Ebenezer Toller, late superintendent of the county

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

asylum. Dr. W. R. Ancrum (Chairman of the Visiting Committee) presided.

The COUNTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dorington) said that, in accordance with a resolution passed at the last Quarter Sessions, the Committee of Visitors had invited the representatives present to meet them that day in order that they might state their objections to the proposed pension to Mr. Toller. Dr. Ancrum took the chair as Chairman of the Committee of Visitors, and would make a statement to them as to the grounds upon which the amount of the proposed pension had been fixed by the Committee of Visitors—as they thought necessary.

Dr. ANCRUM said the deputation was probably aware that Mr. Toller's pension was granted under the statute of 16th and 17th Victoria—the Lunatic Asylums Act, 1853—which stated as follows: "In case any superintendent, chaplain, matron, or any officer or servant of any asylum become from sickness, age, or infirmity, incapable of executing the office in person, or have been an officer or servant in the asylum for not less than twenty years, and be not less than fifty years of age, it shall be lawful for the Committee of Visitors of such asylum, if in their discretion they think fit so to do, but not otherwise, to grant to such superintendent, chaplain, matron, or other officer or servant such annuity by way of superannuation as they in their discretion think proportionate to the merits and time of service of such superintendent, chaplain, matron, or other officer or servant (whether incapable from sickness, age, or infirmity, or retiring from long service and age), and every such annuity shall be payable out of the rates lawfully applicable to the building or repairing of such asylum," &c. The Act was passed in 1853, and in 1862 a Committee of the House of Commons sat on the subject of lunatic asylums, and made a report, to the following paragraph of which he would call their attention :— "It would seem desirable to reduce the time at which the Committees of Visitors may grant superannuation allowances to their medical officers. Their duties are so peculiar, and such painful consequences are known to result from incessant intercourse with the various forms of this distressing disease, when prolonged for many years, that your Committee believe it would tend to greater efficiency of service if the period which stands at present at twenty years were reduced to fifteen years." This was from the report of a committee which took evidence on the subject, and in the passage he had quoted the committee deliberately stated its opinion that a person who took the superintendence of an asylum was placed in so peculiar a situation that he deserved increased consideration from those who granted him an annuity. When the Act of 1853 was passed there was no appeal from the action of the Visiting Justices, who had full power to grant a pension, and the pension was chargeable on the rates. In 1862, however, in consequence of the report of the Committee of the House of Commons, the action of the Visitors was modified. The length of service at which a pension could be granted was diminished to fifteen

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

years, and it was further provided that the annuity should not be chargeable or payable out of the rates of any county until such annuity should have been confirmed by a resolution of the Justices of such county in general or Quarter Sessions assembled. Mr. Toller was elected to the post of medical superintendent to the Gloucester county asylum in 1862. At that time his salary, inclusive of perquisites, amounted to £900. Five years afterwards it was increased to £1,000. Four years afterwards it was increased to £1,100, and at that sum it remained for some time. It was afterwards increased by £50 for one year, and thus stood at £1,150. The perquisites of the office had been commuted to a money payment, and latterly Mr. Toller had received £50 more on account of the assistance he gave in superintending the patients at the Second County Asylum. During the period of Mr. Toller's service there had, of course, been various reports of the Visiting Justices, and reports of the Commissioners in Lunacy as to the state of the asylum, and he (the speaker) would refer to some of those reports in order that the meeting might know what was the opinion of the Commissioners and of the Visitors as to the way in which the asylum had been conducted. He had before him a large number of reports and extracts from reports, some of which he would read. He would not read them all, as he should only weary the meeting by so doing, but would state shortly a few of the extracts. In 1865 the Commissioners reported:—"Our visit to-day has satisfied us that Mr. Toller is discharging his duties with energy and ability; and that the institution is, in general, in a very favourable state." In 1867 the Committee of Visitors' report stated that "The successful treatment and cure of confirmed chronic lunatics on a large scale, as has been accomplished in this asylum during the last four years, appear to be new features in the treatment of lunacy and to be unequalled, as they believe, in the experience of other county asylums. . . The Visitors need scarcely remark that these cures could not have been effected without the exertion of a more than ordinary amount of energy, ability, and vigilance on the part of Mr. Toller and his subordinates." The Commissioners' report for the same year stated that "The condition of the asylum is upon the whole, very satisfactory; and Mr. Toller evidently continues to devote his best attention to the welfare of the inmates." In 1868 there was an extract from the Committee of Visitors' report which stated: "Still the Visitors have great confidence in the skill and unwearied exertions of their superintendent, Mr. Toller . . . remembering that five years ago—" the state was so and so. The Commissioners' report for 1868 stated that "The condition of the asylum continues to be, upon the whole, very satisfactory; and Mr. Toller, who shows an intimate knowledge of the cases of the patients individually appears to devote his best energies to the discharge of his onerous duties as superintendent." In 1869 the Committee of Visitors' report stated that "The whole working of the asylum has gone on satisfactorily

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

during the year." The Lunacy Commissioners' report for the same year stated that "The management and state of the asylum continue most creditable to Mr. Toller as superintendent." The Committee of Visitors' report for 1870 stated "Such had been the system attempted in this county and carried out with the success indicated under the able superintendence of Mr. Toller," &c. The Commissioners, in their report for the same year, said: "Mr. Toller is, we think, entitled to great credit for the pains he has taken to provide for the amusement of the patients. . . . We have had abundant evidence of Mr. Toller's anxious desire to promote the efficiency of the institution and the welfare of the inmates." In 1871 the Commissioners said: "It gives us pleasure to have still to remark, as on many former occasions, how much is done here to counteract disadvantages incident to the many structural defects of the wards by the liberal supply, not alone of associated amusements, but of ward entertainment and occupation. . . . Mr. Toller continues to labour zealously and successfully in his important duties." In 1872 the Commissioners said: "We have again to bear testimony to the able and zealous manner in which Mr. Toller discharges his duties as medical superintendent." In 1873 the Commissioners' report said: "All this is to us very satisfactory as showing that the patients here are well cared for by those in whose hands are vested their charge and treatment." In 1876 the Commissioners' report said: "This is not the time of the year when the airing courts look their best, but their condition shows that the superintendent does not, while studying the comfort and welfare of his patients indoors, overlook what is essential to their health and enjoyment when taking exercise within the asylum precincts." In 1877 the report of the Committee of Visitors stated that "Great credit is due to the medical superintendent . . for the various means employed for entertaining the inmates." In 1879 the Commissioner's report stated as follows: "We have devoted the whole of yesterday to the inspection. . . . We are, upon the whole, able to report favourably. Serious defects no doubt exist; some of these arise from the original defective plan and construction of the building, and others from the fact that the accommodation is insufficient in extent for the number of patients whom it is at present necessary to receive here. . . . Yet there was no undue excitement during our inspection. Nor was there much complaint on the part of the patients." Turning from these extracts to others from the general minutes of the Visitors, in July, 1868, one of these minutes stated: "The application of the superintendent for an increase of salary in accordance with the notice of the last meeting having been considered, the Committee unanimously determined to increase his salary £100 per annum, in testimony of their high appreciation of the zealous and able manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office." In 1873 the salary was increased from £600 to £700. In 1877 an

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

application was made by Mr. Toller for another increase of salary, and it was resolved that in consideration of his past services a further addition of £50 should be made to his salary. It might appear to some of the deputation that the salary of the superintendent had been large. It was all very well to say that this county was more economical than other counties. It had been so in most respects, but in certain matters they must follow the general average of the whole of England. If they expected to have a good medical superintendent they must pay him according to the rate at which superintendents were paid in other asylums. He had taken the pains to abstract as far as he could the records of the payments in twenty-four of the principal asylums in Great Britain—similar to the asylum in Gloucestershire—and he found that out of those twenty-four asylums twelve paid their superintendents either £1,200—a similar salary to that received by Mr. Toller during the last three years of his service—or else a larger sum. He did not mean to say that these statements as to salary were absolutely accurate. He had taken them, assisted by a person who was an expert in these matters, and he believed he had not overrated the amounts. In most of the asylums the payments made to the superintendents took in the form of certain perquisites, and it was impossible to calculate exactly how much was the money value of these perquisites. He believed that the Gloucester asylum was almost the only asylum in Great Britain in which no perquisites—except a house, landlord's repairs only to which were done by the Committee—were paid to the superintendent. In all other asylums there were perquisites of some kind given—more or less. Taking the whole of the twenty-four asylums he had referred to—and in most of them the number of patients was less than in the Gloucester County Asylum—the payments to the superintendents in twelve of them averaged either £1,200 or exceeded £1,200, including perquisites. He would also state that in calculating the payments made in these asylums it must be recollected that superintendents, when first appointed, never, he might say, received the total sum they did after they had been some time in the employment of the county. They entered the service in the asylums at a lower amount than they afterwards received, and this amount was increased gradually according as the merits of the superintendents were appreciated by the Visitors. He (the speaker) had also taken the averages, as far as he could get them—for in some of the reports one could not get the statements accurately made—in the cases of twenty-two asylums of the cost of salaries and wages per week. The average was 2s. 1¾d. per week for each patient in the twenty-two asylums of which he had been able to obtain reports. The average cost in Gloucestershire was 2s. ⅛d. (hear, hear). Therefore the cost in the Gloucester asylum was below the average, and there were only seven asylums in Great Britain in which the weekly cost was less than in Gloucestershire, and they were less by ½d., 1d., or 1¼d. only. Therefore it might be said

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the Gloucester Asylum was not conducted in a lavish manner. Referring to the extracts from reports which he had read, he wished to state on the part of all those gentlemen on the Committee, and himself especially, who were not inexperienced in what went on in an asylum, and who alone had the best and only opportunity of knowing how the asylum was conducted, that as far as Mr. Toller's talents or ability went, he had proved a most energetic and zealous servant of the county—and there was not a dissentient voice among the members of the Committee in stating that. The Committee stated so positively, and if any reports had gone forth that Mr. Toller had neglected his duty or been deficient in attendance, he (the speaker) could say that such conduct on Mr. Toller's part was not known to the Committee of Visitors, and the Committee believed the contrary. The members of the Committee were all thoroughly convinced that as far as Mr. Toller was able he had done his duty thoroughly and efficiently. He would turn now to the question of pensions granted in other asylums. It must be recollected that it was not a new thing for the Court of Quarter Sessions to grant pensions. It was a new thing that their action was questioned, and it must not be supposed that the Committee of Visitors of the Gloucester Asylum, consisting of gentlemen of experience in the affairs of the county, which had been conducted according to the tradition of economy which had always prevailed in this county, should neglect that principle of economy, and should wish to be lavish to any person. The Committee had acted under the precedents they found to hold good throughout the whole of Great Britain. It was useless to say, "You shall not act according to that precedent." They must do so. They could not employ a proper person unless they did so. This question was to a certain degree a medical question. The public did not understand the cares and anxieties which were attached to such an office as that of a medical superintendent of an asylum, and the importance of possessing a talented, energetic, and efficient person. When it was said that medical superintendents were overpaid, it must be recollected that they were exceptional persons. Fifteen instances had been collected of the granting of pensions to medical superintendents in asylums, and it was found that in every instance, except three, amounts equal to more than half the salaries and allowances had been granted. One of those three instances was that of the late Dr. Williams, of Gloucester Asylum, who had a salary and perquisites estimated to amount to £800, and who received a pension of £300. This instance might seem to be a precedent which it would be appropriate to follow in the present case. He might be allowed to state, however, that Dr. Williams received an injury from a bite—he was bitten in the hand by a patient—and was himself desirous of retiring from the service of the county. He was not like Mr. Toller, who was most anxious, had his health permitted, to be able to continue in the service of the county, but he desired to retire, and he (Dr. Williams) having private means, said to the Com-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mittee, "If you will give me £300 as pension I shall be glad to retire." It was not in consideration of what his services had been; but Dr. Williams himself asked for and fixed the amount of his pension at £300. He (the speaker) said that this single instance, in which a person had been in the service of the county seventeen years—not so long as Mr. Toller—did not hold good as a precedent. The two other cases to which he had referred were small cases, one of the pensions having been granted forty years ago. A small sum was in that case granted; the superintendent had only made thirteen years' service, and he retired forty years ago, before this Act of Parliament came into operation. The County Chairman had suggested to him that it would be well to state the returns of which he had been speaking, and he would do so. At Hanwell Asylum the total annual value of the superintendent's post was £700, and he retired with a pension of £466 13s. 4d.—the highest amount possible. At Colney Hatch the salary was £900, and the superintendent retired with half his salary. In the West Riding of Yorkshire the superintendent, after twenty years' service at a salary of £1,200, retired with a pension of £533 6s. 8d. At Whittingham the salary was £1,225, and the superintendent retired with a pension of £750. In a Kent asylum the superintendent, having received a salary of £400, retired with a pension of £150; this was the case which occurred forty years ago. In the same asylum seventeen years ago, a superintendent having received a salary of £500, retired with £350; and in another case in the same asylum, after 12 years' service at a salary of £900, the superintendent retired with £400—not even having served the statutable time. In this county the late Dr. Williams, after 17 years' service at £800, retired with £300, under circumstances he had already explained; while Dr. Boyd, in Somersetshire, after 21 years' service at £800, retired with a pension of £450. In a Suffolk Asylum the salary of the superintendent was £1,000, and his pension £600; in a Surrey Asylum the salary was £1,300, and the pension was £700; in a Derbyshire Asylum the salary was £800, and the pension £400; in Denbigh, Wales, the salary was £500 and the pension £330; and in Bristol, Dr. Stephens' salary was £500 and his pension £250—he not having finished the full time. There was another case at Dean in which the salary was £750 and the pension £500. In granting these pensions it was absolutely necessary that there should be some basis on which they might be calculated. They must take into consideration the amount of salary accorded to persons about to retire from the public service. In the civil service, according to the Act of Parliament, a man retired on a superannuation allowance according to the salary he had received; and, after the reports which he had read, he held that no man in this world had a greater claim to any privilege which the country conferred than the superintendent of a county asylum. Therefore calculating the pension according to the civil service rate, Mr. Toller would be entitled to a pension of £520, and, had

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he been in the service of the country, he could demand a pension of that amount. The Committee of Visitors, who were the only and best judges of what Mr. Toller's services had been, had to do justice to the person whom they pensioned, as they had to take into consideration the payments that were to be raised from the ratepayers of the county. They had not to look upon the question merely from one point of view, but had to look at it all round. They had to do justice to the person whom they considered a deserving individual, and therefore it was that taking into consideration the payment that Mr. Toller received, the precedents of the retiring pensions in all the asylums in Great Britain to the particulars of which they had been able to get access, the civil pension to which Mr. Toller would have had a right by Act of Parliament had he been in the service of one of the public offices of the country, the Visitors had proposed to grant to Mr. Toller a pension of £550. The proposal had not been made capriciously, but after due consideration, and it was based on certain principles. The Committee would be very happy to hear any logical arguments which might induce them to depart from the proposal they had made (applause).

The Rev. H. W. MADDY said he would not weary them with any arguments of his own upon this important question, but merely ask them to kindly hear three members of that large deputation, who would endeavour to explain to them why they thought the sum of £550 was an excessive amount to grant to Mr. Toller, and why, also, they thought the pension should be reduced to the lesser amount of £350 (applause). First, Mr. Maddy called upon Mr. Cadle, who, he remarked, was entitled to speak first, as he was the prime mover in the matter (hear, hear).

Mr. T. CADLE (Guardian) said that Dr. Ancrum had stated to them what Mr. Toller's salary was at various periods of his service, and he thought that they should put the salaries together so as to arrive at a proper sum which should be granted as superannuation. He had worked out that and found that if they calculated the average amount of Mr. Toller's salary according to the number of his years of service the average amount had been £1,042.

Dr. ANCRUM—That is correct.

Mr. CADLE, continuing, said if they took 19-60ths of the average sum—£1,042—they would arrive at the sum of £347.

The COUNTY CHAIRMAN—That is without the addition of seven years.

Mr. CADLE—Without the addition.

Dr. ANCRUM remarked that in the Civil Service it was obligatory to pay on the highest salary of the last three years.

Mr. CADLE said of that he was perfectly well aware, but then came the question, were there any grounds on which the magistrates should do so in this case? Was it right that they should do so under the present circumstances? Dr. Ancrum had previously referred to the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

resolution which he (Mr. Cadle) proposed at the Board of Guardians at which he had had the honour to sit for thirty years, and one argument Dr. Ancrum used in favour of the proposed pension was that the superannuation allowance proposed to be granted to Mr. Toller now and the salary given to the new superintendent did not increase the rates, because the salary that was given to Mr. Toller and the pension to the late Dr. Williams were more than was proposed to be expended now in the salary to the new superintendent and the pension to Mr Toller. But was this a time, or had it been the time for the last seven years, when they should go to the extreme amount possible? He stated in his resolution that it was very difficult to collect the rates from what he declared to be the already over-burdened ratepayers. He thought that that difficulty was actually experienced, not only in the Union he represented, but in all the Unions in the county (applause). There were gentlemen present who knew the mineral district within his Union, and could anything be more deplorable than the state of things there? Thus, the difficulty of collecting the rates was, he thought, a ground why they should not go to the extreme amount they were entitled to give.

Dr. ANCRUM—Excuse me for interrupting you, but the extreme amount Mr. Toller is entitled to is £800.

Mr. CADLE said he would admit it if ten years' service were added.

Dr. ANCRUM—No, according to the Act of Parliament.

Mr. CADLE, continuing, said that to show the difficulty there was in collecting the rates and the increase in the rates which had taken place during the last twenty years, he would take an instance in his own parish. He found that that parish twenty years ago was assessed at a sum of £12,900, and the rates were a little under 1s. 8d. in the £; the parish was now assessed at over £20,000, and they had great difficulty to manage with a rate of 1s. 10d. in the £. He thought this was convincing proof that the rates were increased, and that this was a wrong time to give a high pension. He arrived now at another point. The magistrates had appointed a gentleman to Mr. Toller's vacant office, who, he had no doubt, was an efficient person, otherwise they would not have appointed him. The salary given to the new superintendent he believed was £750—the County Chairman, he thought, gave him that information some time ago. Should they not assume, or had they not a right to assume, that the salary of the new officer's predecessor was in excess of what it should have been—(applause)—and was that not a ground why the magistrates should not give the large pension they proposed to do? He had calculated this matter, and would like to say that if they calculated the amount of pension to be given on the salary given now to the present superintendent the allowance would be only £270 a year, instead of £347 (hear, hear). He might be allowed to make one other remark. Sir Michael Hicks Beach, in his speech at Quarter Sessions, said they should not be ruled by popular clamour in reference to this matter.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

He did not say that Sir Michael was not right in that remark, but in the case of most things that had been accomplished during the last fifty years there had been a great deal of popular clamour before anything was passed in the Houses of Parliament. He (the speaker) had received numbers of letters from various parts of the county, since he brought this matter before the Board of Guardians, of which he was a member. He had been asked to arrange for public meetings to be called in all parts of the county with reference to the proposed superannuation allowance, and he had had one or two letters from gentlemen asking him to request Sir Thomas Crawley Boevey, the High Sheriff, even to call a county meeting for the purpose of representing that the proposed pension was too high. At the preliminary meeting on the previous Saturday it was unanimously decided to ask the magistrates to reconsider this matter, and not to grant a higher sum than £350 per annum (applause).

Mrs. McIlquham, who represented the Tewkesbury Board of Guardians, said—I am perfectly well aware from what Dr. Ancrum has stated that this pension is not calculated on the Civil Service basis. But still the Civil Service has been cited as a guide by which we are to judge whether this is a fair pension or not. According to the report in the "Gloucester Journal," Mr. Toller entered the service of the county July 1st, 1863. His resignation took place, I believe, in July of this year. If so, his term of office was nineteen years and a few weeks. Civil Service servants are expected to give forty years of service, and are not entitled to any pension unless they have served twenty years, and then only if they are over 60 years of age, and can produce a medical certificate to show that they are quite broken down in health. Mr. Toller's age is given as 59; he is therefore one year below the standard of age and length of service.

The County Chairman said there was a special provision in the Act.

Mrs. McIlquham continued—Besides these concessions the loss of time and emoluments were taken into consideration by the committee, and the pension was calculated on £1,200 instead of £1,100, the actual salary. There was further granted seven years of "added service." By this method the proposed pension was swollen to £540, when a final addition of £10 was given to make, I presume, the even amount of £550. According to my calculation on Civil Service rules, I think Mr. Toller's pension should amount to £366 13s. 4d; but he is not entitled to even that, he being under 60 years of age, and not having given the minimum amount of service. The reasons assigned for Mr. Toller's retirement are that he was recommended to do so by the Visiting Committee on account of ill-health. I should not question that statement but that I have here a letter from the Home Secretary, dated July 17, 1882, sent to a Mrs. Driver, of Standish Lodge, Stonehouse, promising that the circumstances attending the death of Walter Partridge shall "receive his most serious

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consideration." The letter was addressed to a person who in the previous year, namely 1881, had through the Home Secretary brought charges of cruelty against officials in the Gloucester County Asylum, which charges were inquired into by a sub-committee of the Visiting Committee, and who reported them as "disproved or not sustained;" the Lunacy Commissioners agreeing that "The general evidence supported the conclusion at which the Visitors had arrived." But when the death of Walter Partridge was made public Mrs. Driver wrote to Sir William Harcourt, again calling his attention to the Gloucester County Asylum, and the Home Secretary replied by the letter of the 17th July, to which I have already referred. Under these circumstances I am sure it would be a great source of satisfaction to many ratepayers and to this deputation if the Visiting Committee can assure us that they advised Mr. Toller to resign before they received any communication from the Home Secretary or the Lunacy Commissioners. Whether on a right or a wrong foundation I cannot say, but unquestionably there is a strong feeling out of doors against Mr. Toller receiving a large pension, and I do not think that feeling has its origin so much in a desire to save the ratepayers' money as in an impression that Mr. Toller did not possess that power of organisation which Dr. Ancrum has told us is so necessary in gentlemen who fill offices like Mr. Toller's. If he had, I think we should have been spared the painful fact of there being two inquiries in two successive years into the management of the Asylum, of the excitement which was caused in the public mind by the superintendent retiring at a time when public feeling was uneasy about the conduct of officials employed at that asylum—officials possessed of so little restraint that they insulted Gloucester jurymen in the streets—and people drew their own conclusions as to how hapless lunatics fared under the control of such men. If all this was due to Mr. Toller's ill-health I think we may fairly say that the county was a loser by Mr. Toller's services before he retired. These reasons are I think at the bottom of that feeling which a medical newspaper styled the parsimony of guardians "accustomed to deal out pittances to paupers." Even if other counties can afford to be extravagant, I am sure Gloucestershire cannot. At a pension of £300 a year the late superintendent, Dr. Williams, received nearly £6,000 out of the county rates; and if the proposed pension of £550 be granted Mr. Toller, we may reasonably expect, he being only 59 years of age, that he will receive a very large sum out of the county rates (applause).

Mr. ONLEY (Guardian) said he thought Dr. Ancrum would at once see that the Civil Service did not apply to the present case, as it did to many others. It must have been noticed particularly that Mr. Toller had failed in two great essentials, viz., length of service and age; he had failed in those two great essentials, which were specially mentioned in the Civil Service arrangements. It was true that some Act of Parliament had been subsequently passed, but there was nothing that met

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the case. Mr. Toller stood before them that day as he stood before the Justices—simply on his own merits. The respresentatives of his own union had been in the habit of visiting the asylum, and had not only had the poor patients before them, but had gone into every place and watched them as closely as possible. They had obtained every information. He was not there to say, for a single moment, that Mr. Toller had not discharged his duties fully, but they had to call him to account, and to call him to account very severely, and for that he (the speaker) was called to account for a report he drew up on one special occasion, when they found many faults in the asylum. They were not inexperienced in these matters; they had seen them and knew them; and so far as the patients were concerned they knew them individually, and from time to time they had heard from them everything connected with the asylum. The asylum had been conducted well, but it might have been conducted better (hear, hear). It had been said that the Guardians were opposed to any pension being granted, but he maintained that this was not true. He did not hesitate to say that, as far as his union was concerned, that they had always recognised the pension, and he believed not a person was present at their meeting on the previous Saturday who did not recognise that the pension should be granted. On the other hand, while it was recognised that some pension ought to be granted, the opinion was also strongly held that no pension in the first instance should have been promised (hear, hear), and he told them distinctly that when the time came that they had an elective Board for the County, instead of magistrates self-elected, there would be no pensions granted then, but men would be paid liberally for their services, and would have to save enough to take care of themselves and their families in old age (applause). He could assure them that members of Boards of Guardians would not like to do anything dishonest in such a matter as this, and if Mr. Toller was promised a pension he ought to have one; but then came the question of amount, and this had been most ably put before them. He had been a Guardian for forty years, and could speak from experience, when he assured them that these were not the times for granting excessive pensions (hear, hear). Mr. Toller had had a good salary throughout his time, and such a salary as dignitaries of the land had not had. Some people said that he ought not to have had his hunting, but the speaker did not agree with this, because it was a recreation Mr. Toller deserved, and one which gave him that energy which he so much stood in need of to enable him to discharge his duties. It was a form of recreation the speaker had been glad to indulge in, and he would not have enjoyed the health he had known during his life of three score years and ten, but for the exercise he had taken. He maintained that Mr. Toller had a right to hunt if he thought proper, but he also thought that having had this immense salary for all these years, and the County having found an efficient man to discharge the duties for two-thirds the amount, they ought not

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to give Mr. Toller the maximum pension on his retirement. He thanked them for hearing him so patiently, and he did hope that the Committee would take the matter into consideration, and remembering the condition of the county at the present time—what seasons the poor farmers had to contend with—and seeing the difficulty there was in the collection of the rates, would bring the proposed pension down to the sum mentioned not only by the union he represented, but by every one in Gloucestershire. The sum mentioned—£350—was in excess of what would be given by some unions, but, taking the aggregate, they would be satisfied if the magistrates saw their way clear to satisfying justice both to Mr. Toller and to the ratepayers by fixing the proposed pension at £350 (applause).

Mr. W. Priday (Guardian) said that the deputation had arrived at the amount of £350, for reasons which he would explain. Mrs. McIlquham and Mr. Cadle had put before the meeting statements based in the one case on the Poor Law system and in the other on the Civil Service system. The average of those two came to something like £350 or nearly so. Therefore whatever little differences of opinion the members of the deputation might have had before they met, they agreed to waive them and press upon the magistrates to grant a pension at all events not above £350. One or two of the arguments brought forward by Dr. Ancrum were not, he thought, very strong ones. For instance, when Dr. Ancrum told them they must be ruled by the systems adopted in other counties and must go by precedents, he (the speaker) thought if they were to go upon that system *ad infinitum* they should never arrive at anything fresh. Some county must set an example in this respect, and when it was considered that agriculture was never more depressed than at the present time, he did think a beginning might be made in this case. Dr. Ancrum had also said that he was not aware of any irregularities having taken place at the asylum. Nevertheless they must not forget, judging by the results and looking at what had taken place as reported in the newspapers, that it seemed at all events that things had not been managed with that roseate hue with which some gentlemen would seem to colour them (hear, hear). He would like to say one or two words as to the future good which he thought would be the result of this meeting. It was quite clear that Mr. Toller must have some superannuation allowance granted to him, he having entered on his service with the full understanding that he would have a pension, but he (the speaker) wanted Gloucestershire to set an example in this respect, and he wanted the gentleman who had recently been appointed to Mr. Toller's late office, and those who would in the future be appointed, to understand—and he was sure the deputation also wanted them to do so—that the opinion of the ratepayers was decidedly and definitely against pensions altogether (hear, hear).

Dr. Ancrum—There is the Act of Parliament.

Mr. Priday, continuing, said if the ratepayers had not set their

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

face against pensions altogether, they were at any rate in favour of reducing them to the minimum extent and not of straining them to the highest point. At Quarter Sessions the County Chairman had put forward statistics as to the amounts given in other counties, but, as he had just said, he thought Gloucestershire was of sufficient importance to set an example in this respect, and that it should not always be looking out to see what other counties were doing. He was very pleased that the deputation had been invited to discuss this question in a friendly manner. Whatever preliminary opinions might have been entertained by the members of the deputation before the previous Saturday, at their meeting on that day they came to the definite conclusion that a sum should be granted not less than £350 (applause).

Mr. ONLEY—Did Mr. Toller retire of his own accord, or was he requested by the Justices to retire?

Dr. ANCRUM—No, he was not.

Mr. CADLE thought it was not fair to ask that.

Mr. ONLEY said he had been asked to put the question.

Dr. ANCRUM said the state of Mr. Toller's health was such that he could not discharge his duties. He was advised by his medical man that he could no longer discharge his duties as superintendent.

Mr. ONLEY—Then he retired at his own wish, not at the discretion of the Justices?

Dr. ANCRUM—Certainly.

Mr. ONLEY—That is the answer—"certainly."

Mr. ILES (Cirencester) said a statement he wished to refer to was that Dr. Williams had £800 a year salary and a pension of £300. If one superintendent of an asylum had only a salary of £800 and the next had £1,200, surely the man who had £1,200 was less entitled to a pension than the one who had £800 for doing the same work (hear, hear). The superintendent with £1,200 had a better chance of saving money. This seemed to show also that Mr. Toller's salary was a high one, and that was to him an additional reason why the pension should be very much lower than had been proposed. He entirely agreed with the remarks of Mr. Cadle, and certainly hoped that in future the county would be very cautious in expending the full amount possible (hear, hear).

Mr. WARD wanted to know what was meant by allowances. Dr. Ancrum had made a statement to the effect that Dr. Williams received £400 as salary and £400 in allowances.

Dr. ANCRUM remarked that he said there were allowances—he did not say they amounted to £400. The allowances were as follow:—A house kept in constant repair inside and out; a garden with persons to attend to it; patients constantly attending about the premises, saving the superintendent a servant; coals, gas, water—which last was an item in the Gloucester asylum—washing, milk, vegetables, some food for a horse, scraps for poultry, and what were called "necessaries" besides, which consisted of the mops and pails

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and brushes and various things used about the house. It appeared to him that the superintendent had all his expenses paid with the exception of his meat and bread, wine, beer, and groceries. Therefore, if they calculated what a man with a family of five children and several servants might consume, he thought they would not believe that the commutation of these items for the sum of £300, saparately from the house, was very large.

Mr. WARD asked whether he was to understand the printed report made at various times by the Visiting Justices was not a fair and just report? He had made copies from the different reports made by the Visiting Justices, and found that in 1857 the superintendent had £400 a year salary, with house, coals, candles, and washing. That was everything he had.

Dr. ANCRUM said he was speaking of what had taken place latterly.

Mr. WARD said in 1862 the superintendent's salary was £600 a year, with house, coals, candles, washing, and vegetables, but distinctly, and in both cases, without board. That was paid to Dr. Williams. In 1864 the superintendent had £500 a year without board, but with house to live in, coals, candles, washing, and vegetables. They could not make £300 or £400 a year out of coals, candles, washing, and vegetables.

The COUNTY CHAIRMAN—There is an "etc." after the vegetables.

Mr. WARD said there was an "etc.;" he noticed that (laughter), and it seemed to cover a multitude of things.

Dr. ANCRUM—It did.

The COUNTY CHAIRMAN said—I wish to take the question of the pension in anything I now say a little out of the course which it has taken to-day, and I wish rather to argue it upon general grounds, and especially as to why a pension of £350 would be wholly inadequate to accomplish the purposes for which pensions are granted. I imagine the pension is not only granted because Mr. Toller may require a fitting reward for his services to the county, but because it is right it should be granted in such a way as to enable the county to obtain and retain the services of an efficient gentleman at the head of the County Asylum. This is quite certain: the number of candidates for such appointments as these is extremely limited. High as the salary is we were giving, and large as is the proposed pension, if it is upheld, those terms have altogether failed to bring into the field any considerable number of qualified applicants for this particular post. I will undertake to say of the gentlemen offering there were not more than, I think, five who came up to the standard that we considered fit for a man to be put into the position of medical superintendent of the asylum. It is a most responsible post, in which a man is the arbiter of the destinies of a great number of individuals, where he has the control of such a large institution. It is a matter of extreme responsibility, and one feels the weight of the responsibility in attempting to select a proper person to place at the head of it. I

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

am very glad to hear from Mr. Onley that so far as he is able to judge we have made a good choice for a successor to Mr. Toller. But we should fail to secure a good man at the head of the institution, we should have failed to obtain the services of our present superintendent, if it was to go forth from the Court of Quarter Sessions, or from this meeting, that the question of how much pension should be granted at the end of his services was to be a pure matter of chance, and not to be regulated by precedent or the rules laid down by Act of Parliament. I think £350 would altogether fail to satisfy either the spirit of the statute under which we act, or even the terms of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. This Act fairly interpreted means this: In such a case as Mr. Toller's you have taken a professional man at an age greater than that at which men usually enter the Civil Service, and you place him at the head of an institution. It was impossible therefore for him to serve forty years so as to obtain two-thirds of his salary calculating by sixtieths for each year. And therefore he comes most distinctly under the previous Superannuation Act, by which a number of years' service not exceeding twenty may be added to the number of sixtieths which may be granted in cases where professional men enter such a service at a greater age than civil servants usually do. By common interpretation that twenty years is taken at seven years. Taking therefore Mr. Toller's service at nineteen years, and calculating nineteen sixtieths of the salary he had during the last three years, and adding seven sixtieths to that, you arrive at £520, according to the rules of the Civil Service. Of course that is not the Act of Parliament, however wise it may be, that we are bound to administer under, or to look at. We might, no doubt, use it as a guide in our discretion; but we were bound to look at the terms of the Superannuation Act applicable to the cases of lunatic asylums, and there we found without question a pension might be granted of two-thirds, and special recommendations that such an amount might be granted for fifteen years of service only, in consequence of the harassing nature of the duties of gentlemen in that position. How did we act? We did not go anything like to the extreme we might. We reduced that extreme by £250, and it is held now by the other side that we have granted an inadequate pension, and that it is such a pension that may deter proper officers from occupying the post in question. I do not argue that the holders of all posts should be treated in that way; but I do argue that for posts of so extremely difficult and delicate a nature as Mr. Toller filled, you must grant your pensions on rules bounded by a very narrow discretion indeed as to what you shall give. And I think the committee in fixing £550—I won't tie myself to £550, but approximating to that amount—I think we should not go very much below that point. Allusion has been made to a medical paper which has been sent to me, which shows the view held on the other side. The writer says: "Should it be proclaimed that no retiring pensions, or only very meagre and insuffi-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cient ones, are to be granted in the Gloucester County Asylum, then a very rapid deterioration may be predicted in the character of the officers of that establishment, unless the salaries of the staff be increased in such a way as to compensate for the loss of all prospect of superannuation allowances. But this would be an expensive process for the country, for it ought not to require demonstration that moderate salaries with the prospect of a pension are more economical than large salaries and no such prospect." That is a very fair statement of the case—

Mr. ONLEY—They are "birds of a feather" (laughter).

The COUNTY CHAIRMAN—Even if they are, it shows the opinion of that particular class from which alone we can draw superintendents of asylums. We cannot go out to the general public. These officials must be drawn from a special class, and unless you consult the feelings and even the prejudices of that class, you will not succeed in keeping at the head of that establishment efficient servants. Upon those grounds I think we should be seriously damaging the prospect of future efficiency in our officials if we fell in with the views advocated to-day, and reduced the pension to £350. I quite admit that if Mr. Toller had been an inefficient servant there would be no reason why we should give him such a pension, or any pension at all. But I think no one can doubt Mr. Toller has been an efficient servant, notwithstanding reports that may have been spread. Anybody who has had to do with lunatic asylums must know the immense mass of reports that are brought before one, I may say every day one goes there, which are wholly unreliable, and based upon nothing whatever, all of which yet require to be inquired into more or less. The particular case alluded to of Mrs. Driver is one of such cases. That case was brought before the Home Secretary and the Lunacy Commissioners, and in consequence a very special inquiry was made which was not limited to the patients in the institution but to patients who had recovered and were out of the institution, and who had been there at the time when this lady was in the asylum; and upon the evidence so taken, which was free from any taint of suspicion of undue influence, it was evident she was mistaken as to the treatment she had received. A copy of the report was sent to the Lunacy Commissioners, who were satisfied. The Committee of Visitors themselves are, by the course which these proceedings have taken, somewhat upon their trial (cries of "No, no"). I can only say we have done the best we could for the county, and we believe that in fixing this particular pension we were acting according to precedents obligatory upon us to follow, not only with reference to what Mr. Toller might reasonably expect, but with reference to the future efficiency of the Asylum, and retaining and securing thoroughly efficient officers at his head. And it is upon those grounds that I myself, acting as one of the Visitors, feel bound to say I could not possibly fall in with the suggestion that the pension should be reduced to £350, because, anxious as I am to

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

save the rates, I believe such an amount would not be adequate either to Mr. Toller's services or to attain the object of securing the future efficiency of the asylum (applause).

Mr. CADLE said he was sure the deputation would not like to part without thanking the magistrates for their kindness in asking them to meet and state their views. He must ask the magistrates to dispel from their minds one thing, viz., the impression that they were "on their trial" in the matter, for this reason: Although the magistrates were no doubt very large ratepayers in the county, they must bear in mind that they were not a representative body (hear, hear). And therefore that was the reason why he wished Mr. Dorington to dispel from his mind the idea to which he had referred. The deputation present were representatives of the different Boards of Guardians, and that was one great reason why he thought they should thank the magistrates for inviting them there that day. He would move a most cordial vote of thanks to the magistrates on the part of the deputation (applause).

The motion was carried by acclamation.

Dr. ANCRUM said—We will carefully weigh the arguments that have been placed before us, and we will consider the subject in all its aspects. We have now, I suppose, the opinions of the ratepayers as well as the opinions of the Visitors before us.

Mr. WARD—The opinion generally of the ratepayers is that there should be no pensions whatever.

The COUNTY CHAIRMAN—But we have to carry on the service.

The meeting then terminated, having lasted about two hours.

Guiteau.

We have received a number of letters (not for publication) from our Transatlantic brethren in consequence of our article on Guiteau in the July number of the Journal, either assenting to or dissenting from it, according to the sentiments of the writer. They show not only the deep and widespread feeling excited, but the hopeless difference of opinion which exists on the question of his criminal responsibility—and this, after the entire history of the man is before the public and the profession, including the post-mortem examination of the brain.

Our contemporary, "The American Journal of Neurology and Psychiatry," in a critique on our article has evidently acted upon the Baconian counsel, "He that questioneth much, shall learn much." It has subjected us to the American ordeal so much resented by Herbert Spencer, and has "interviewed" us in a very vigorous manner. We have, however, an advantage over the philosopher in that we can

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.124.552 Published online by Cambridge University Press