

omitting to visit the Richmond Asylum, as, to persons non-resident in Ireland, such a state of affairs appears inexplicable." As the gentleman referred to has declined, or perhaps more correctly speaking, has been unable to do so, I trust that a simple recital of facts conveyed through the medium of your largely circulated periodical will afford ample proof "for the satisfaction of the public conscience that *all* Irish asylums are inspected by the proper officials." I quote as follows from a document supplied me by the Secretary at the Richmond Asylum in answer to these specific questions. 1. Names of governors attending meetings (21) with an average of eight members at each:—Sir John Barington, D.L., Burton Brabazon, J.P., Col. Cunningham, D.L., Alderman Campbell, D.L., Major Ellis, Sir George Hodson, Ion Frant Hamilton, M.P., H. Hamilton, D.L., Sir James Mackey, D.L., The Lord Mayor of Dublin, E. Kinahan, D.L., The Earl of Meath, Richard Martin, D.L., Sir George Owens, Sir John Toulayne, C.B., Viscount Vowerscomb, H. Verdon, Esq. 2. Dates of meetings, 1880, attended by Dr. Nugent, Commissioner of Control, &c., &c. February 1, March 16, April 27, May 18, July 6, August 24, September 21, October 19, November 23, December 17. 3. Visits made by Dr. Nugent in 1880, either with one or more governors or officers of the staff. January 22, February 4, March 2, April 2, June 6, July 19, September 12, November 2.

Independent of the above, I find my colleague inspected the house on four occasions. I am thus particular in giving names and dates so as to obviate all possible misconception when matters of fact are in question, or erroneous inferences deducible. Of my frequent attendance at monthly meetings, whereby the advantage was afforded of a personal communication with gentlemen of position, alike desirous as the Inspectors for the well-being of the institution, Dr. Lalor must have been aware, for although the benefit of his presence at their deliberations had been declined by a resolution of the governors three years ago, and more than once repeated since then, he could not have failed to see me when "called on to read his reports and to afford such information as might be required of him." It is incumbent on me, however, to state that the exceptional course just adverted to was proposed without the knowledge of the Inspectors, and adopted without their concurrence.

Before closing this communication on a very unpleasant subject, I cannot but express a deep regret at the occasion which unavoidably forced it on me. As one of the heads of an important department, I cannot recognise any right on the part of subordinates to criticise before the public the conduct of their official superiors. If there be a dereliction of duty by the latter, a proper tribunal is available in the Executive; the Inspectors have in every mode at their disposal, pecuniary and other, sought at all times to raise the character of Irish asylums by extending the sphere of their utility, while in their Parliamentary reports, they never fail to bestow on their respective staffs the full credit of their successful operation, and as regards more immediately the medical officers attached to them, they have consistently upheld their social status and legitimate independence as educated members of their own profession.

I am, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

J. NUGENT.

Rutland Green, Dublin, 12th June, 1882.

#### A CASE OF ENDARTERITIS WITH INSANITY AND APHASIA.

*To the Editors of the JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE.*

GENTLEMEN,—I beg to offer the suggestion that the case recorded by Dr. Mitchell in "Clinical Notes and Cases," in the last number of the Journal, and provisionally named by the above title, was an example of "Multiple Cerebro-spinal Sclerosis" of Hammond (Charcot's "Sclérose en plaques disséminées").

The symptoms during life, as described by Dr. Mitchell, and the result of the histological examination, both accord completely, in my opinion, with this suggestion.

I am, &c.,

A. HARRISON THOMAS, M.B.

Ayrshire District Asylum, 20th July, 1882.

*To the Editors of the JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE.*

GENTLEMEN,—It is with extreme reluctance that I trespass on your space, and ask you to insert the following letter in your next issue of the Journal (the only organ of publication touching on the transactions of public asylums), but inasmuch as a charge of unsatisfactory management has been made against me in the last report of the Committee of the Somerset and Bath Lunatic Asylum as an excuse for dismissal, I write in self-defence to give it a public contradiction.

To be as brief as possible, I will narrate the circumstances. On June 9th, 1881, I received an intimation from the Committee of Visitors of the Somerset and Bath Lunatic Asylum that, in three months' time from that date, they would dispense with my services as Medical Superintendent and Medical Officer of that asylum, a position to which I was appointed in July, 1868, after having been Assistant Medical Officer there for eight years previously. On March 25th, 1881, I had been requested by the Committee to resign, but refused to do so, no reason being furnished to me, and no complaint being made against me justifying such a request. I asked the Committee to give me a distinct and specific statement in writing of the reasons why they asked me to resign, and were dissatisfied with my conduct. They declined to do so, and I was dismissed from a post which I had occupied for thirteen years, in utter ignorance of any adequate and justifiable grounds for the course which the Committee thought fit to take.

On seeking legal advice as to my position, I was informed that I had no redress before a judicial tribunal, the Committee, under the fifty-fifth section of the Lunacy Act, 1853 (16 and 17 Vict., c. 97), having an *absolute discretion* as to the retention or discharge of their medical officers. This enactment is not construed according to the general and righteous spirit of the law, which requires that the party to be affected by a judgment of any tribunal shall have an opportunity of defending himself; but a *discretionary power to remove* being given to the Committee, they may exercise it without notice and without any statement of the grounds of removal.

To come now, however, to the charge of unsatisfactory management made against me by the Committee let me give extracts from their reports to Quarter Sessions.

In 1881, Jan. 4th, they report, "During the past year the health of the inmates has been good, and the medical treatment, as well for the prevention of disease as for the cure and relief of it, *has been satisfactory, as also the conduct of the officers and servants of the asylum.*"

In 1881, March 25th, the Committee asked me to resign.

In 1881, June 28th, the Committee report to Quarter Sessions, "Early in this year a prevalent feeling in the Committee was shown to exist of *dissatisfaction with the general management of the asylum and of the officers and attendants in it by Dr. Medlicott, and it was plain that a change must be made.*"

With regard, then, to this charge of unsatisfactory management of the asylum, its officers and attendants, I beg to state in reply, it is untrue, and I deny that there was any cause for this alleged feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of the Committee, because the asylum was never in better working order. It is simply preposterous on their part to try and throw dust in the eyes of the public by giving the above-named charges as their reason for asking me to resign. Where, I ask, was it plain that a change had to be made in the interval alluded to (from January to March), and if so plain, why could not the Com-