of the parietal gyri; while the marginal and first occipital gyri, and the posterior fourth part of the temporo-sphenoidal, were considerably affected. Brain much atrophied, especially the left cerebral hemisphere, which weighed 3½ ozs. less than the right. Marked changes of the spinal meninges, of the usual character. Some naked-eye grey degeneration of the posterior part of right lateral column of cord.

In a work on General Paralysis, published in 1880, and on other occasions, I have expressed the view that in general paralysis there is sometimes a systematic sclerosis of cord, or secondary descending systematic myelitis, in an incipient, or nascent, or diffuse form, and secondary to the widespread damage to the brain-cortex, wrought by the lesion of that affection. It may, too, sometimes be secondary to a lesion lower down in the cerebro-spinal axis, and due to a local intensification of the morbid process.

The concluding case in this paper has been inserted as an example of a condition transitional between that of the other cases of the paper and the condition just referred to as often found in general paralysis. It presents an extreme and palpable degree of a condition which in its milder degrees is frequently present.

Dr. G. H. Savage, also, has published several cases of general paralysis with lateral sclerosis.

OCCASIONAL NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

Case of Frederick Marshall.

Much criticism has been offered in the public press on the course pursued in the case of Marshall, alleged to have murdered a girl at Woolwich. He was committed by the magistrates for trial at the Central Criminal Court. When, however, the case came on for hearing, it was found that Marshall had been removed under a warrant of the Home Secretary to the Broadmoor Asylum. The criticism to which we have referred had not only reference to a very minor point—the signing of the warrant of removal by an *Assistant*-Under Secretary of State, but to the removal of an alleged criminal to the criminal lunatic asylum without a jury having decided that he was unable to plead, or the fact of his guilt having been first established.* In reply to the

* Baron Huddleston has more recently taken occasion, when giving judgment in another case, to observe that the whole subject of the Lunacy Law must be reconsidered, and he gives as an illustration of this that "There is a power in our Criminal Law by which a man charged with the gravest offence may, on the certificates of two justices and two medical men, be withdrawn by the Secretary of State from trial; and this also without open examination of witnesses, and without the ordinary test of cross-examination. No doubt at present there may be no probability that a Secretary of State will abuse such a power. But it is an enormous power to give to any person to remove from trial one who has been committed for trial for a serious offence."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.31.133.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

objections made by Mr. Baron Huddleston to the course pursued, the Attorney-General stated that the power exercised was an old power, created in 1840,* to order the removal of a prisoner before trial, if certified to be insane. In Dr. Orange's Presidential Address in 1883, he gave figures showing that down to the end of 1882 there had been 80 persons admitted into Broadmoor who had been certified to be insane whilst awaiting trial, of whom 48 were charged with the crime of murder.† Ware, to whose case we shall shortly refer, and Oliver who stabbed Lindsay, were both certified to be insane before trial, and so was Mary Ann Thompson, the wife of a railway porter at Colchester who recently killed her child, all these cases occurring in the present year. There is, therefore, nothing in the case of Frederick Marshall which is unprecedented or even unusual. Whether it is proper or desirable that persons alleged to have committed crimes should, on medical certificates, be removed to Broadmoor without any indictment being preferred against them at the assizes, is another question. As a matter of fact we believe that up to the present time, the right course has been pursued, not only in the interests of the patient, but in the interests of Society at large. It is not remarkable, however, that such a procedure fails to meet with the approval of a lawyer who is prepared to prove that his client never committed the act, which it is assumed he did commit when insane. Nor is it surprising that the press should animadvert upon this mode of action. Thus a morning paper writes:—"Magistrates and doctors can be got to sign anything when invited to do so by much less august personages than Secretaries of State. . . . If a man charged with murder is mad, let him be proved to be mad in open Court. Where is the necessity of secrecy? And what if he be innocent of the crime with which he is charged? Then why should Marshall, for instance, be assumed to be guilty if in the eyes of the law he is innocent? Yet he is treated as a criminal lunatic. Guilt and innocence, sanity and insanity, should be treated, not by Secretaries of State, but by judges; and it is to be hoped that the law will be quickly amended so as to make this compulsory, even in the case of assumed lunatics." Another London paper writes in the same strain:—"Marshall may be kept in Broadmoor for the rest of his life, or sent at any time to take his trial, or unconditionally released, just as the Secretary of State pleases, though of course he would neither be tried nor set at liberty unless medical opinion announced him to have recovered his reason. He is classed among criminal lunatics, and yet he has never been found by any competent tribunal to be a criminal, nor after any public enquiry to be a lunatic. He may be innocent of the crime imputed to him. The evidence of his insanity might fail to satisfy a jury. In the former case, a great injustice has been done to him; in the other case, a most atrocious murderer escapes the gallows. Surely this branch, at least, of the Lunacy Laws needs amendment."

* Act 3 & 4 Vict., with the Act 27 & 28 Vict. making it compulsory.
† "Journal of Mental Science," Oct., 1883, page 336.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.31.133.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We confess that we do not share the fears expressed by the newspapers. It is very true, no doubt, that the evidence of a prisoner's insanity might fail to satisfy a jury, but this, from our point of view, is only another way of saying that the jury would not have the knowledge or the judgment necessary to form an opinion, and that the physicians consulted by the Home Secretary would be infinitely more likely to arrive at a correct conclusion. In this, as in other cases, although there may be a seeming want of the publicity which the English Law usually demands, it is practically true that

"Whate'er is best administered, is best."

And as regards publicity, it is certain, at any rate, that there has been as much publicity as in the other cases that have been similarly dealt with. Counsel for the prosecution stated in Court that the certificate upon which the Home Secretary's warrant of removal was granted had been signed by two magistrates and two medical men, in conformity with the statute. He further stated that the prosecution had thought it right to take the statement of a medical man at Woolwich, who had seen the prisoner when he had attempted to commit suicide, and who thought he was not responsible for his actions. Also that two physicians had seen the prisoner on behalf of the prosecution, and that there was only one opinion, namely, that the prisoner was insane.

Mr. Justice Hawkins on the Plea of Insanity in Criminal Cases.

We note with great satisfaction the observations made by one of her Majesty's Judges in his charge to the Grand Jury at the Shropshire Winter Assizes. His remarks had reference to the case of Anthony Ware, charged with murder at the Salop and Montgomery County Asylum, Bicton, near Shrewsbury. After the homicidal act was committed, the patient was removed to Broadmoor. Under these circumstances the finding of a true bill did not come under the consideration of the jury. The Judge, however, regarded the case as so "very interesting" that he went out of his way to comment upon it. It appears that Ware had been for a considerable time a dangerous lunatic. Dr. Strange, the Medical Superintendent of the Bicton Asylum, stated that while he had been a patient at the County Asylum he had committed several murderous assaults upon patients, and in one instance upon an attendant. On the fatal day this homicidal patient had been out for an airing with another dangerous lunatic named Smith; indeed, there seemed to have been some 15 or 16 patients of the class together. On returning to the asylum Ware provided himself with an iron bar from a bedstead, and was seen by the attendant in charge to strike the deceased (Smith) upon the head with it. From the wounds thus received the latter quickly

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.31.133.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press