3·50 dols. for each patient, which is precisely what the State pays in Massachusetts for the board of the pauper patients at Northampton and elsewhere. The interest charge on the cost of the establishment is about one dol. a week for each patient; which is not far from the charge at Northampton. At the new Worcester hospital this interest charge will be nearly 3 dols. a week, and at the Danvers hospital it will be about 4 dols. a week for each patient. The State pays this charge both in Massachusetts and New York. In my opinion the Willard Asylum is too large, and I even doubt whether there is any economy in managing an establishment with more than 500 patients, but the usual evils of large institutions are not visible at Willard—so well does Dr. Chapin keep his work in hand. There are, in fact, four separate establishments on this one estate, and when the new group of detached buildings is completed and occupied, next summer, there will be five separate buildings or groups, capable of containing 1,450 patients. The farm is, in fact, dotted with buildings, and looks like a manufacturing village rather than an insane asylum. The steward lives in a separate house, built of bricks, and costing less than 5,000 dols., but far better for a family than the quarters usually assigned to such an officer in the hospital-palaces which superintendents delight to build. Several of the medical officers and other officers of the higher grade live in the detached buildings, and the attendants take their meals among the patients. The farm, which was originally bought for a State agricultural college, is well cultivated, though much of it is still covered with wood. The location is exceedingly pleasant, close by Seneca lake, and the buildings are not perched on the top of steep hills, as is the expensive fashion in Massachusetts. What was paid for grading and road-building at "Hawthorne hill" in Danvers would have bought two or three farms like that at Willard, the cost of which was 50,000 dols. There is no city or large town near, and consequently no convenient market, so that the supplies of meat, poultry, etc., must be furnished on the spot, and there are large slaughter-houses and poultry-yards. The whole establishment has the air, except for its factory-like buildings, of a great inland farm, as it really is.

HABITUAL DRUNKENNESS.

We have received from Dr. Joseph Parrish, of New Jersey, U.S., an open letter to John Charles Bucknill, M.D., of London, on the subject of Habitual Drunkenness. The following are extracts from Dr. Parrish's letter:—

"My dear Sir,—Reports of your speech at Rugby, before the Temperance Association, of your correspondence with Dr. Clouston, and your essay in the 'Contemporary Review' for February last, on Habitual Drunkenness, etc., are before me.

"You seem to have used these means of communicating with the medical profession, and to some extent with the general public of Great Britain, for the purpose of discrediting the testimony of witnesses from this country before what is popularly known as Dr. Dalrymple's Parliamentary 'Committee on Habitual Drunkards,' in 1872, and of injuring the cause which they represented before said Committee.

"As some of your statements are, to say the least, unguarded, and as the impression they are evidently meant to convey, must be false and injurious, I feel it to be due to my colleague and myself, who appeared before the Committee above referred to, and to the Inebriate Asylums and Reformatories in this country, that your erroneous statements should be corrected.

"On several occasions, both in your own land, and during your recent visit to America, you have publicly expressed your right to make open enquiry into the 'credibility' of 'statements' made by Dr. Dodge and myself before the Committee of your own Parliament, in answer to important questions which were submitted to us by the Committee. You also accuse us of being 'deputed to teach' the English people 'how to change the laws of your country,' etc., and

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.23.103.452 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of 'vaunting the absolute cure of thirty-four per cent. of their (our) diseased drunkards, and pushing their (our) creed, and their (our) system, with unblushing propagandism,' etc.

"For this reason I shall address you by an open letter. I shall spend no time, however, in attempting to prove the 'credibility' of the American witnesses before the Committee of your House of Commons. That is sufficiently recognized in this country, and as the Committee were abundantly satisfied of it, before they sent for the witnesses, and by intercourse with them were reassured of their position, your sneering reproach has no weight. As to our being 'deputed to teach,' etc., I have only to refer you to the following official communication, which was addressed both to Dr. Dodge and myself:—

"'House of Commons, London, March 2, 1872.

"'SIR,—I am directed by the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to consider the best plan for the control and management of habitual drunkards, and of which Committee Dr. Dalrymple is chairman, to *request your attendance before them for the purpose of giving evidence.* The Committee would be glad if you could make it convenient to attend upon them during the week commencing the 15th of April. Should this be inconvenient, on as early date after as convenient to yourself. The days of meeting of the Committee are Tuesdays and Fridays.

"'I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"'ARTHUR F. KINGSCOTE, Committee Clerk."

"But for such a request, from such a source, we should not have left our own land, on such an errand, and I am quite sure that no member of the Committee will sustain you in your ill-natured reference to our testimony in this connection, as the relation between the British Committee and the American witnesses was of the most agreeable and satisfactory nature.

"But to your several statements. You assert that your observation of American Inebriate Asylums was, 'that the gentlemen *confined* in them were generally rather proud of their position,' etc., and that 'they were there under a very lazy and shameful pretence of curing a disease which did not exist, by remedies which were not applied.' In the very next sentence you refer to the absence of restraint and *confinement*, and of the perfect freedom of inmates to walk out, procure liquor and bring it in to their own rooms. The evidence which you offer for this is, what 'a friend told' you about being invited to take 'his choice of spirits,' by four of these unfortunate inebriates, during a visit he made to one of these Asylums 'for the City of New York.'

"But you have overlooked the fact that this interesting social interview between your friend and his friends, occurred at an institution that was never represented in the 'American Association for the Cure of Inebriates,' and hence the story has no place as evidence against the Association whose 'creed' and 'system' give you so much pain. You seem also to have forgotten that said 'Asylum for the City of New York,' as you term it in the Review article, is located on an island on the East River, where there is no saloon or other place where spirits are sold, or given away."

Dr. Parrish then goes on to discuss at length the vexed question whether intemperance is disease, coming to a distinct conclusion in the affirmative. He points out that the American Medical Association, a body of physicians representing every State and different sections of all the States of the Union, has, like the British Medical Association, passed a resolution affirming the propriety of establishing institutions for the treatment of inebriates. The Association of Medical Superintendents of American Asylums has recently followed in the same track, and he quotes other resolutions to the same effect from other important public bodies. He concludes his letter as follows:—

"I now proceed to notice your reference to what you call the change in the 'condition and position of Inebriate Asylums,' in the United States, since Dr. Dalrymple's visit in 1871. You speak with the coolest complacency of 'the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.23.103.452 Published online by Cambridge University Press

State Inebriate Asylum at Media,' as 'supported partly out of public funds,' and add, that it 'had been suppressed because it was said to be a failure.' In every word of this statement you are entirely at fault. The Sanitarium at Media was not a State Institution. It never received a shilling from the public treasury. It was never 'suppressed.' In my answer to question 2,586, before the House of Commons Committee, in 1872, I said distinctly, 'It is a private Asylum; it has an Act of Incorporation by the State to give it legal position and recognition, but it is managed by a Board of Corporators, purely as a private enterprise.' If you consult your Blue Book and pursue your investigations to other parts of the testimony, you will learn more about the institution than perhaps you care to know. It did not prove 'a failure.' On the other hand, it did discharge thirty-three per cent. of its inmates, most of whom are to-day living, and are honourable and productive citizens. Its Board of Directors has never been dissolved, and it still holds its chartered rights. It was closed voluntarily, because it was expensive to maintain on a private basis, and it was the desire of its Directors to see it conducted under the auspices of the State. I was the President of its Board of Directors, from the time of its inception to its close, and knew personally every inmate. I frequently visited the Capitol during the sessions of the Legislature, had repeated interviews with the Governors and with the Committees on appropriations, and what I have said elsewhere, I repeat here, to wit:

"The reason the Sanitarium and other valuable institutions in Pennsylvania have failed to receive the State aid that they deserved, is owing in great measure to the exacting demands for immense sums of money for the insane. You say, also, that the Asylum on Ward's Island 'had been ordered to be suppressed for the same reason,' but my previous reference to that Institution is sufficient. It was never so far acknowledged as an Inebriate Asylum by its officers, as to induce them to affiliate with those who have believed in and promulgated the disease doctrine. You speak also of changes in the law, and refer especially to 'the New York Statute' as being declared 'unconstitutional, and it is, therefore, now never acted upon.' In reply to this sweeping declaration, which conveys the impression that there is no law in New York on the subject, I copy for your information the following extract from the comprehensive law, which may be found in the

"'REVISED STATUTES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK IN RELATION TO THE CUSTODY AND DISPOSITION OF THE ESTATES OF IDIOTS, LUNATICS, PERSONS OF UNSOUND MIND, AND DRUNKARDS.

"'§ 1. The supreme court shall have the care and custody of all idiots, lunatics, persons of unsound mind, and persons who shall be incapable of conducting their own affairs in consequence of habitual drunkenness, and of their real and personal estates, so that the same shall not be wasted or destroyed; and shall provide for their safe keeping and maintenance of their families and the education of their children, out of their personal estates, and the rents and profits of their real estates respectively.

"'§ 2. Whenever the overseers of the poor of any city or town in this state discover any person, resident therein, to be an habitual drunkard, having property to the amount of two hundred and fifty dollars, which may be endangered by means of such drunkenness, it shall be their duty to make application to the supreme court for the exercise of its powers and jurisdiction.

"'§ 3. If such drunkards have property to an amount less than two hundred and fifty dollars, the overseers may make such application to the county court of the county, which is hereby vested with the same powers in relation to the person and real and personal estate of such drunkard, as are by this title conferred on the supreme court, and shall in all respects proceed in the like manner subject to an appeal to the supreme court.'

"I might quote similar statutes from the law records of various States in the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.23.103.452 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Union, but the limits of this letter will not permit a complete exhibition of the legal view of the case.

"It is very evident, my dear Doctor, that you did not visit our Institutions with the purpose of learning much about them. You did not see them in any spirit of earnest enquiry and examination. You display a very discreditable ignorance of their polity, and of the laws by which they were created, and under which they exist.

"You did not sit down as did Dr. Dalrymple, with the Officers and Directors of Asylums, examine their statistics and records, and converse freely and fairly about their work. I have yet to learn from a single Institution that you visited, that you made any real search into the facts concerning a single case, and that you made any medical or clinical enquiries, or gave yourself time to examine and study recorded facts. According to your own statements in the papers before me, you took what 'the physician to a neighbouring hospital told' you about the use of spirits, and 'concluded that these American Inebriate Asylums seemed in some way to be part of the great whiskey fraud.'

"You also talked with some of the disaffected inmates of Asylums, who, according to your own expressed estimate of them, are unworthy of confidence, and took their testimony as conclusive. Your superficial and hasty view covered only six institutions, and the fact that since Dr. Dalrymple's visit the number of them has increased, and that the preparations for the organization and construction of new ones have been commenced in several States, entirely escaped your notice. Under these circumstances you cannot censure us on this side of the water for calling to your mind, and to the mind of the public, your extraordinary, and as it seems to us, unpardonable oversight.

"Had you visited this country, on your professed errand of enquiry after truth, in the same spirit and with the same genuine philanthropy that prompted the late Dr. Dalrymple, you would have pursued a similar course of enquiry, and returned to your country, doubtless, with a confirmation of the same views and experience that he conveyed to his Committee, and through it to the world.

"And now, in conclusion, permit me to say that the work among us, in this behalf, was not entered upon in any spirit of rivalry with 'Lunacy Commissioners,' in Scotland, or elsewhere. Nor did we place ourselves in antagonism with Lunatic Asylums and their management, in this or any other country. We realized in common with the whole world of philanthropy this dreadful scourge of intemperance. We were compelled to admit that all was not being done that might be done to mitigate its sorrows and reduce its burdens. We were willing to aid if we could. From the standpoint of medical men, we thought we saw a vulnerable point of attack. We believed, as I have endeavoured to show you, that there were morbid impulses, morbid conditions, and morbid results, in the chain of causation and consequence, which it was our duty to investigate, and, if possible, to relieve. We hail with pride and gratification every effort of every kind, from every source, that promises palliation or modification of the direful calamity with which mankind is scourged in this fact of inherited and acquired propensity to alcoholic excess, and count our instrumentality as but one among many that are being brought to bear upon the evil. With these views we think it strange that alienists, either abroad or at home, should be aggrieved because our efforts have been in a good degree successful, and are attracting favourable attention, and it is still a source of regret that this class of scientists remain in doubt as to facts which have been verified by all the known means of evidence within the range of our profession, and which the popular mind accepts as well established.

"We shall continue our work in the same spirit of earnest and faithful enquiry, and shall, at all times, be ready to meet objections, and consider them fairly, from whatever quarter they may come. We congratulate ourselves that such men as Drs. Peddie, Clouston, Boddington, Playfair, and others, who are

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.23.103.452 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinguished for fairness and research on your side of the Atlantic, have already given their honourable names and their vast influence in support of this noble cause, and I feel assured that when you allow yourself time and reason to secure the removal from your own vision of the mist of prejudice, you will not be content to stand with a diminutive minority of the British Medical Association on this very important subject.

"Yours truly,

"JOSEPH PARRISH.

"Burlington, New Jersey, U. S. A.
"May 10, 1877."

KNAVERY AND SUPERSTITION.

A very curious tragedy has lately occurred in the town of Cervera (5,000 inhabitants), Province of Logrono. The details are given by a number of newspapers, but the following is an account translated from the "Imparcial:"—"A rich proprietor, well known in the country for his advanced opinions, refused on his death-bed to accept any spiritual help, notwithstanding the prayers of his family and the advice of his best friends. There was a moment, however, when it was thought that the patient had modified his determination; the priest of the parish presented himself by the side of the dying man, but, finding that he persisted in his refusal, he retired precipitately, saying aloud to those who were present that, after the death of the reprobate, the devil would come in person to take charge of his body and conduct him to hell. Two days after the family were watching over the corpse of the relation they had lost, when the door of the mourning room was suddenly flung open, and an indefinable being dressed in scarlet, smelling (*apestando*) of burnt sulphur, and dragging an immense tail, presented himself before the mourners, who, full of terror, rushed away from the room. On hearing the screams of these people, a man-servant, who was in the next room, snatched up a revolver and entered the scene of the scandal. As may be supposed, he stood terrified at the sight of the devil; but thinking that it would be better to kill his infernal majesty than be killed by him, he fired three shots at him point blank (*a boca de jarro*). Shortly after the family of the deceased found themselves face to face with the sacristan of the parish, *dequisé en diable*, with three shots in his breast and the foam of death upon his lips. The authorities at once interfered, and took four priests into custody. On the following day the unhappy sacristan was buried."

Appointments.

CEELY, R.W., M.R.C.S.E., L.S.A.L., has been appointed Assistant Medical Officer to the Haydock Lodge Lunatic Asylum, near Newton-le-Willows.

LILLEY, G. H., M.D., M.R.C.P.L., has been appointed Assistant Medical Officer to the Warwickshire Lunatic Asylum, Hatton, vice Jones, resigned.

MURDOCH, W., M B., C.M., has been appointed Assistant Medical Officer to the Perth District Lunatic Asylum, Murthly, vice Daniel, appointed to the Derbyshire Lunatic Asylum, Mickleover.

RIDLEY, J. H. W., M.R.C.S.E., has been appointed Medical Superintendent of the Dunston Lodge Lunatic Asylum, near Gateshead-on-Tyne, vice Blackett, deceased.

TYNER, R. G., L.R.C.S.I., L.K.Q.C.P.I., and L.M., has been appointed Assistant Medical Officer to the Wiltshire Lunatic Asylum, Devizes, vice Masterton, resigned.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.23.103.452 Published online by Cambridge University Press