

unsound mind, and properly a person to be under some jurisdiction in December last, and the question was whether, between that time and the present, she had recovered her intellect, and whether they considered she had perfectly recovered, and was now a person of sound mind and capable of taking care of herself and her property.

The Jury retired at a quarter before two o'clock, and in half an hour returned into Court, when Mr. CLOUGH, the FOREMAN of the jury, said that thirteen of them were of opinion that Mrs. Turner was of sound mind, and seven were of a contrary opinion.

The following verdict was then handed to the MASTER: "We find Mary Jane Turner to be of sound mind, and the jury cannot separate without reflecting upon the disgraceful conduct of Mr. Metcalfe, the keeper of Acomb House, and beg to draw the attention of the Commissioners in Lunacy thereto." Mr. Clough added that he should not register his vote, and that the jury had particularly requested that the above expression of opinion might be embodied with the verdict.

The MASTER: The only verdict is the verdict whether the lady is of sound or unsound mind.

Mr. CLOUGH: That is what I explained to the jury.

The MASTER said he must take the opinion of the thirteen jurymen as to the state of Mrs. Turner's mind, and any other recommendation he would deal with in a different way.

Mr. PEMBERTON asked the representatives of the press to take notice of this presentment.

The inquisition was then signed by the thirteen, as to Mrs. Turner being of sound mind, Mr. Clough, the foreman, declining to do so.

Commission of Lunacy on Mr. Ruck.

On the 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th days of August, a commission of lunacy was opened by Edward Winslow, Esq., Master in Lunacy, and a special jury, at the large hall of St. Clement's inn, Strand, for the purpose of ascertaining the state of mind of Lawrence Ruck, Esq., of Sittingbourne, Kent, and Montgomeryshire. The case created considerable excitement, there being a large number of gentlemen interested present.

Mr. Montague Chambers, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Ballantine, and Mr. Vaughan appeared for the petitioner (the wife of the alleged lunatic); and Mr. Edwin James, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Petersdorff, and Mr. Gordon Allan for the alleged lunatic, who was present from the commencement.

The commission and order of the Lords Justices having been read.

The MASTER, in opening the proceedings, explained, with great ability and precision, the nature of the duties the jury would have to perform, and said that although the custom had been to inquire and determine the date of the commencement of unsoundness of mind, yet the present act of parliament only required that they should consider the present state of mind of the supposed lunatic, with a view of deciding whether he was capable of managing his own person and estate. Having reviewed the definitions of lunacy as compared with unsoundness of mind, he said that to prove the present unsoundness of mind they might have to go some distance back in the history of the case, to prove circumstances showing a manifest incompetency to manage or govern his own affairs. He wished to observe that these proceedings were not taken with any antagonistic feeling, but rather to benefit the whole of the parties concerned. In conclusion, he said the alleged lunatic had been confined for some lengthened period in an asylum near Uxbridge, in Middlesex, but he must tell the jury that that fact should not influence them in the slightest degree in the verdict to which they should come, after hearing the evidence which would be adduced.

Some lay evidence was first given bearing upon Mr. Ruck's state of mind before he was confined in Dr. Stillwell's asylum. Two years ago in the drawing room of Mr. Thurston, an old friend, he drank half a glass of brandy and water when he suddenly uttered a fearful howl and kicked Mr. Thurston in the stomach, he rushed out of the house and went home. Mr. Lloyd, landlord of the Wynstay Arms Hotel, testified to excitement of conduct. Two men sat up with him at night as some of the gentlemen in the house had spoken to the host about him. He used to take the fly out, drive some distance along the road and then come back. He sometimes went out in this manner in the dead of the night. He took Mr. Lloyd into a private room, and said, "Mary Jones has had two children by me. She has murdered them both. Here is a lock of their hair, and I shall be swung for it." A commercial traveller complained that he looked at his letters, but Mr. Ruck explained that he had made a mistake in looking into the pocket of the wrong coat, and sent an apology. Mrs. Williams testified to Mr. Ruck behaving in a most excited manner in his own house. He once locked himself in the drawing room, burned some clothes, and tore his scarf and shawl into small pieces, and went into the cellar and set the taps of two barrels of beer running. He would drive out at three or four in the morning, and remain out four or five hours. He was not like a drunken man, he appeared more wandering; when he was tipsy he was quiet. Mrs. Jones testified that he promised to give her £500 if she would get him the nurse-maid; his manner changed, and he became very restless. David Arnold, the postman, testified that

K²

Mr. Ruck offered him £300 if he would allow Arnold's wife to sleep with him on alternate nights. John Edwards testified that he used to pick up stones and say they contained small spots of sulphur; that he caused a shaft to be sunk in the land, saying that copper and iron was to be found, which was not so; that he gave witness £5 in discharge of a debt of £3 10s.; that he locked Mary Jones up in a room, said she was mad, and that if he had a gun he would shoot her. Lewis Williams, ostler at the Wynnstay Arms, testified to Mr. Ruck's midnight drives, to his having once pulled down the pictures in two rooms and ranged them round the room. He was naked, and said he wanted the girls to see him so. He poisoned two dogs.

Mr. Hugh Lloyd examined by Mr. Serjeant BALLANTINE: I am a surgeon, and practised near where Mr. Ruck lived, in Montgomeryshire. I have attended the family for years. During the early part of the time the greatest affection existed between them. Mrs. Ruck was a model of a woman. On the 25th of October I was summoned to see Mr. Ruck at Pantluddw, when I noticed he was excited, and there was a strange appearance about the eyes. He behaved very strangely. I did not order him to have any medicine. I saw him a few days afterwards, when he appeared very sullen. He passed me by, and when I spoke to him he answered me abruptly. I became apprehensive of what he might do, and went and consulted with Mr. Evans, and some one was sent after him to watch him. Soon after that his room was opened at the Wynnstay Arms; a gun and pistol were found in it.

I am obliged to ask you; do you know Mary Jones? Yes.

Did you ever have any improper connection with her? No; decidedly not.

Did you ever have connection with Mrs. Ruck? Decidedly not.

Nothing improper ever occurred between you? No, not at any time.

You based your opinion of his conduct upon what you saw of him? I did.

Cross-examined by Mr. E. JAMES: I have known Mr. Ruck 17 years. I did not sign the order for his confinement. I was not asked to do so. It was unfortunately notorious that Mr. Ruck drank. It would produce delirium, but that is different to insanity. Delirium tremens, the result of drink, was capable of being cured. When he passed me sullenly on the 27th of October, it was not explained that he was doing so to avoid me. He went with Mrs. Ruck to Welshpool, and from thence to Dr. Barnett's, at Reading, where he was taken and confined. During the 17 years I have not seen him twice in the state of excitement I have referred to. During the last two years I can only say, from report, what effect liquor has had on him.

Re-examined by Mr. M. CHAMBERS: Pantluddw was not furnished, and Aberdovey was looked on as the residence of the

family. When I saw him I should not say it was delirium tremens on the 25th October, in my opinion; I drew a broad distinction, feeling that he was suffering from worse than delirium tremens.

By the MASTER: I formed my opinion from the evidence I heard from others, and from what I saw myself. I had no opportunity of examining at Welchpool into the delusions. I have not seen him from time to time till to-day: I must say that he looks much better to-day than when I last saw him.

Mr. EDWIN JAMES applied, before the Court rose, that Mr. Ruck might be allowed to remain in town each night pending the inquiry, to enable him to have those consultations with his solicitor and counsel which were necessary to the end of justice. Mr. Ruck was perfectly quiet, and would answer any question which the learned Commissioner might put to him. Should the application be granted, Mr. Ruck would be willing to have any of Mr. Stillwell's assistants he may deem necessary.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said he had no ground of opposition to the application of his learned friend; the only thing was, whether it could be done legally.

The MASTER said it appeared to him to be a most reasonable application; and he asked Mr. Stilwell if it was compatible with the present state of the lunacy laws to accede to the application.

Mr. STILLWELL, as far as he was concerned, had no wish to oppose the application; but, as the lunacy laws stood, he could not allow any person under his charge to sleep out of his house for the night without the consent of the Commissioners in Lunacy, and an application could not be made for that consent without the sanction of the friends of the alleged lunatic.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS repeated that he had no objection if it could be legally done.

It was then arranged that if it was not too late an application should be made to the Commissioners. Should they fail in it, however, Mr. Ruck, will have to go to Moorcroft House, Hillingdon, near Uxbridge, every night till the termination of the inquiry.

Mrs. Mary Ann Ruck was then examined by Mr. Serjeant BALLANTINE: I have been married seventeen years to Lawrence Ruck. I have had six children. The eldest is fifteen years old. We did not occupy separate rooms. He was in the habit of drinking occasionally. While living at Pantluddw, he was at times excited. He has gone out in frys at all times of the night. I have gone with him into the woods as late as one o'clock in the morning. During that time, from April to the end of 1856, he was at times much excited. He was very much haunted by the tunes and voices he had heard last. I took the children to him at Aberdovey. My husband would occasionally come and sleep there. We never quarrelled. When at Aberdovey he was very affectionate. In August, 1857, we went to Manchester; the Barnetts were with us. I have

known Mr. Barnett ever since I was a child. While at Manchester my husband behaved very affectionately. Was at Manchester a week, and then came up on a visit to some friends in Kent. While in Kent I received a letter from my mother, which caused me to return to Montgomery. When I got home he had left. I followed him and found him. He was much excited, and fancied he saw people rushing into each other's arms. He laughed, and tried to point them out to me. When we left Newtown to go to Welchpool, a gentleman whom I had never seen got in. He was a perfect gentleman, and nothing of a familiar or improper character took place between us. Next day Mr. Ruck made serious charges against me, and said I should not go with him, as the "boots" would do for me. He took my money (£20, which my mother had lent me,) away from me. He so behaved himself that I sent for a medical man, Mr. Harrison. No intimacy of an improper character ever took place between Mr. Barnett and myself. When my husband got out of the coach he ordered a fly, but I had the horses taken out. After that he sat in the fly for some time. He then went to his bed-room, and some time after he sent for me, and said I ought to ask his forgiveness. He charged with me the grossest improprieties, and used the most coarse and disgusting language to me. I was obliged to leave the room. While at Welchpool, on Thursday and Friday night, I did not sleep with him. Neither on one night or the other did anything of an immoral character take place between me and any one else. I have read the affidavits of Drs. Winslow and Sutherland, containing imputations against myself, but they are without foundation. We went to Reading from Welchpool. We stopped at Birmingham as we passed. We slept in the same room. He went backwards and forwards to his portmanteau; and seeing me saying my prayers, he said "You might well say your prayers." We stopped at Reading from Sunday to Thursday. He ran away while at Reading. He was brought back by Mr. Barnett and a constable, and appeared to be very merry, saying it was a good joke. He was friendly then with Mr. Barnett, and begged his pardon. We slept together that night, and he charged me with the most disgusting things. He said telegraph was speaking north, south, east, and west, about me, and charged me with general prostitution. After this he imagined he had forgiven me, but said he would give me a large bonnet, and take me to London. He said if I had not the bonnet every one would know my character. He said he would take me to a place where I could walk out of a night with others of my class. I never put any corrosive sublimate in his food. I was not aware that any connection existed between Mary Jones and my husband. At Welchpool he said Mary Jones had been tormenting him, and talking to him all night. He said Mary Jones had had two children by him, and said that she had murdered them. He repeated this at Reading. In his portmanteau were pieces of paper, walnuts,

oatmeal, flour, corkscrews, string, candles, and such like. I found a letter to a governess in his portmanteau. When my husband left I had no money. I then sold the stock at the Welsh farms for £1300. I let the cottages. His property in Kent is worth about £1200 a year. Out of the £1300, I paid £579 debts, £220 for housekeeping, &c., and £500 for these proceedings. I have no other money. Since he was at Moorcroft House I visited him. I saw him in January. He still entertained the same delusions respecting my conduct. He told me that he had not forgotten a single thing that had happened at Welchpool, and referred to Mary Jones. On asking him to what he referred, in respect of my conduct, he replied that he would rather not tell me. I should only say they were delusions.

Mr. Chambers read a memorandum written by the alleged lunatic in his account book.

Witness: All the charges therein stated as regards myself are untrue.

Cross-examined by Mr. JAMES: The memorandum was written at Welchpool. Knew Mr. Ruck's father. He is a country gentleman. He lived near Sittingbourne. Did not see him before marriage. My husband inherited £1200 a-year from an uncle or a cousin. He never proposed to me that we should separate. Miss Jones lived principally with my mother. Miss Jones is my cousin. For two months before the event of which I have spoken in October last, I was away from my husband. I was in various places—Bedfordshire, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Kent, and Reading. During the last two or three years he was in the habit of drinking to excess. He would take it in fits and starts. Had a letter from Mrs. Matthews on the 28th of last October, and I started to go home. He was not perfectly well when I left, he had rheumatic pains.

Mr. JAMES read the form which the witness had signed for her husband's admission to the asylum, and in which the cause of Mr. Ruck's insanity was stated to be partly hereditary and partly from intemperance, and asked—Who inserted those words?

Witness: Dr. Barnett.

Mr. JAMES: But did you know that his supposed insanity was partly hereditary?

Witness: I did not.

Mr. JAMES: But you signed the order for your husband's confinement in the asylum?

Witness: I signed the order, but I did not read the order.

Mr. JAMES: Did you not order Dr. Stillwell not to admit Wainwright, his solicitor, to see him?

Witness: When?

Mr. JAMES: In May.

Witness: Well, I did.

Mr. JAMES: Were you not told that your husband was recovered?

Witness: Yes.

Mr. JAMES: Did you not request that your husband should not be allowed to have any money in order to be enabled to conduct these proceedings?

Witness: I did request that he should not be allowed to do so.

Cross-examination continued: I cannot say that I ever told Mr. Gore not to let my husband have any money to carry on this case. I did give him £28 when he went into the asylum. He has had nothing more. I have paid Dr. Stillwell £100. I am to pay him £400 a year. I have kept £500 out of the sale of the stock to carry on the case; and I did refuse to let my husband have any money to try the question of his sanity. Mr. Gore receives the rents. He advised me to take out this commission. I was alarmed when I slept with my husband on the Saturday night at Birmingham. I slept again with him on the Sunday night at Reading, and on the Monday he was sent to the lunatic asylum by my order. No rents have been paid for the Welch property since he has been confined.

Re-examined by Mr. M. CHAMBERS: I am keeping the six children now. Mr. Gore is a brother-in-law of Mr. Ruck's. He manages the estates in Kent, and since Mr. Ruck's confinement that gentleman has received the rents, but I never received anything from it. Mr. Ruck's family are well off, and could have supplied him with funds to go on with this case. I have always been willing that Mr. Ruck should have been taken care of by his friends, but they have refused to take him. I thought he was insane, as he was under delusion. I had no power to make orders on Mr. Gore for money. I knew the proper course was to apply to the Lords Justices. At times I have seen my husband since he has been confined. I have not let him see me as I knew it irritated him. In February he refused to see me. In January he wrote me a very rational letter. That letter wished me to come up, and I travelled all night to see him. He was first angry and then kind, but afterwards he said he had not forgotten anything which took place at Welchpool.

By the MASTER: I have repeatedly been to Moorcroft House, but he has refused to see me. Dr. Stillwell told me it was better not to. Mr. Ruck did not know I was there at those times.

By the JURY: I took the things he mentioned in the letter with me. His mind appeared connected with the contents of the letter.

Mr. Harrison, surgeon, of Welchpool, examined by Mr. VAUGHAN: I was called to Mrs. Ruck, at Welchpool. She explained to me what had occurred on the journey up to Welchpool. Mr. Ruck appeared to be fidgetty and excited. He got into a fly without any horses in it, and he would not leave it for some time.

He said he would not go into any house where Mrs. Ruck was, and she was in the hotel. I asked why not, and he said that she had misconducted herself in the coach with a fellow passenger, and explained that the person and Mrs. Ruck made indecent signs to each other. He went to my house, but I afterwards found him in another fly, but this was in a shed where the empty carriages were kept. He was some hours in it. I suggested that attendants should be set to watch him. I did so in consequence of the manner in which he conducted himself. From what he said I believed his mind to be unsettled. Whenever I visited him he complained of great immorality on the part of Mrs. Ruck. They were wrong, because she was a most exemplary person. He also said she was connected with every man in the place. I did not think that state was caused by immoderate drinking. Mrs. Ruck told me on the first visit that her husband had been leading a most irregular life, at one time taking very large stimulants and at others adopting the reverse course. I attributed his state not exactly to acute mania, but an unsound state of mind. It was not from delirium tremens. He gave the two men who attended him a 10*l* note each, but they returned it to me. The men were serjeants on the staff of the Montgomeryshire militia.

Cross-examined by Mr. E. JAMES: The serjeants did not say that the 10*l*. was given to either to let him go. Excessive drinking might have had an effect on Mr. Ruck. I believe the first night that it was necessary he should be watched. I said I did not see anything in his unsettled state of mind inconsistent with the result of intemperance. It might have arisen from the abuse of intoxicating liquors. I do not now think it was the result of intemperance.

Re-examined: The two serjeants of militia who watched him were respectable men in the town, and were not dressed in their uniforms.

Mr. Richard Barnett examined by Mr. M. CHAMBERS: I am a surgeon, in practice at Reading. I have known Mrs. Ruck 20 years, and Mr. Ruck since 1851. In October last I was telegraphed to go to Welchpool. I went and saw Mr. Ruck, who received me very cordially. He said "I am very glad you have come, as there are two fellows placed over me to watch me, and I want to get away." I asked where was Mrs. Ruck, and he said, "Mrs. Ruck is nothing to me; she is as bad as any woman can be." He then walked out of the room in the most abrupt manner. He several times entered the room and as suddenly left it. I asked him to go to Reading, and we started by post to Shrewsbury, where he told me he had painful evidence of his wife having committed acts of immorality with other men. When at Reading he gave me into custody for attempting to poison him. When I went to the station some of the alleged-to-be drugged wine was sent for and tasted, and the whole charge was found to be frivolous. On the Tuesday

Dr. Conolly was sent for and arrived. I have watched him packing and unpacking his trunk. He had a strange collection in his trunk, and would take the contents out and throw them to his wife and put them back again. It was a strange collection, consisting of candles, string, paper, chisels, bread, stones, flour, and so on. He was at times very kind to his wife, but the next moment he would accuse her of the most fearful acts of immorality. I have no doubt about it but that he was of unsound mind. He said he had slate mines worth 30,000*l.* a year, and his copper mines were of untold value. While at Reading he never charged me with any improper intimacy with his wife. Nothing of the sort ever took place between me and Mrs. Ruck. I never put any corrosive sublimate on his bread. I have seen him at the asylum at Moorcroft House several times, and still found him under the same delusions. Once he refused to see me, and afterwards explained the cause of it, "that it was hard for him to be put into Moorcroft House."

Cross-examined Mr. JAMES.—I went down to Moorcroft House with Mr. Williams, the solicitor for the petitioners. The statement in my affidavit that I have retired from practice is erroneous; I am still in actual practice. Mrs. Ruck's order for her husband's confinement is in my handwriting. The cause of insanity is ascribed to "hereditary insanity and intemperance." I read it over to Mrs. Ruck before she signed it. I swear I read it to her. I did not make the inquiry as to whether the hereditary insanity was true. She said that her husband's father and brother were eccentric. I do not think that every person who is eccentric, should be confined like Mr. Ruck has been. I think the hereditary eccentricity and intemperance were the cause. Dr. Conolly and I were together when we examined Mr. Ruck. I did not know that the act of parliament says the examinations should be made separately. I never read the act of parliament. I did not know before you told me that it was a misdemeanour to make the examination conjointly. Mr. Ruck chose to ride outside the coach from Shrewsbury to Reading. I rode inside with his wife. I did not consider it altogether safe for him to ride outside. I did say in the order I signed that he was profligate in his expenditure. He had a share in a piece of land which he supposed to hold a rich mine. I knew it did not contain anything. Mr. Williams, his wife's solicitor, told me. It was not a fact known to myself that he was profligate in his expenditure. It was wrong for me to put it down as such in the certificate. He told me he had exceeded his income. I would not sign a certificate to lock up everybody who exceeded his income. He did not reimburse me in my expenses for the journey to Reading. Dr. Conolly recommended Moorcroft House. I do not know Dr. Conolly is the physician of that place. I say in the order I signed, as a fact known to myself, that he is addicted to intemperance. I never noticed it but when in the

train from Shrewsbury, when he had a bottle of stout at Shrewsbury, and two glasses of ale at Stafford. I have known him since 1851, and have dined with him, but never saw him inclined so at any other time but the one I have mentioned.

Dr Conolly examined by Mr. M. CHAMBERS: I went down to see Mr. Ruck on the 3rd of November, while he was at Reading. I should state that I saw Mr. Ruck alone, in accordance with the act. When I saw him he said his wife had been guilty of great infidelity with a number of persons; in fact, that she was not particular with any one with whom she travelled. He mentioned to me that when at Welchpool she was not in sobriety, and some one in the carriage had had connection with her. I have seen him at Moorcroft House, but my mind being made up, I felt satisfied of his condition without speaking to him. I generally avoid referring in these cases to the leading delusions. My opinion is, that Mr. Ruck entertains insane delusions of a dangerous kind, and requires restraint. His delusions would be likely to lead to danger towards himself, his wife, and her supposed paramours. I have heard him declare, as lately as the 18th of June, that he heard his wife go into an adjoining room at Welchpool, and there commit adultery; and he then said he found his wife befouled by other men. He also said that her conduct was notorious, and that it was even known to the drovers on the road. I have known those that have lost their delusions express surprise that they ever entertained them. Speaking from what I have seen of Mr. Ruck, I cannot help saying it would be insecure to himself and his friends to allow him to go at large.

Cross-examined by Mr. EDWIN JAMES: I believe that Mr. Ruck may recover, but it would be at the term of a year or a year and a half. I should not say his case is one of acute mania, but I should designate his case as maniacal. I am consulting physician to Moorcroft House Asylum, and am paid by fees. I know the act says that a certificate should not be signed by any medical man connected with the establishment, as I only send male patients to it. I do not remember receiving a letter from Mr. Stilwell, stating that Mr. Ruck was well, and should not be detained; nor did I receive any verbal message of that sort. I never heard of Mr. Ruck having committed any sort of violence towards his wife or any one else.

Re-examined by Mr. MONTAGU CHAMBERS: According to the usual tests, Mr. Ruck has not got rid of the delusions which he entertained.

By the MASTER: I should expect that the departure of the delusions would be marked by a desire to return to his wife and express his regret for the accusations to which she had been subjected by him.

Dr. Stillwell, examined by Mr. SERJEANT BALLANTINE: I am the proprietor of Moorcroft House. Mr. Ruck was first brought to my place on November 5th last, and has remained there ever since. I took every opportunity of ascertaining his state of mind. He laboured under delusions about his wife. My opinion is, that he is of unsound mind. Since this commission he has refused to speak to me, except in the presence of his solicitor. That was continued down to the present time. My opinion now is, that he is insane. He wished to take his pistol-case and trunk to town on Sunday evening, and when I told him he could not, he said that it was that confounded Barnett and his wife again. I am 27 years of age.

Cross-examined by Mr. JAMES: I gave that expression about Barnett and his wife as a delusion. I believed it to refer to the removal of his trunk. My opinion is, that Mr. Ruck is still insane. I cannot form an opinion as to whether he is curable. I have been two years at Moorcroft; before that, six months at the Derby county asylum, and previous to that I was two years at the Morningside asylum. I am responsible at Moorcroft House. I acted under the orders of Mr. Barnett in refusing to allow Mr. Ruck to see Mr. Fisher, the barrister, who is his brother-in-law, or Mr. Wainwright. I did so without asking him if Mrs. Ruck gave the order. I interdicted him from posting any letters. All his letters were first sent to Mrs. Ruck. I believe Mr. Ruck was and is capable of writing a sensible letter. It is not a rule to interdict the postage of letters in every case. I like to see to whom they are addressed. Mr. Fisher called two days after Mr. Ruck was confined. I would not let him see him. I don't recollect that I told Mr. Ruck Mr. Fisher had called. After the first two days Mr. Ruck was improving. He was slightly excited. He never committed any acts of violence. I don't know whether a sane man would not be slightly excited if he was confined in a lunatic asylum. The Commissioners of Lunacy have seen Mr. Ruck four times. I don't think he ever saw them, unless in my presence or that of my assistant. I stated his case to them. He wished to state his case to them, and he did so on the 14th of November, when they made an entry to this effect, "We have conversed with Mr. Ruck, and find he is considerably improved, and will shortly be discharged. It does not appear to us, however, that the delusions under which he labours are entirely removed." The commissioners were Mr. Campbell and Mr. Gaskell. He broke down before the commissioners; by that I mean he got worse. On December 15th the commissioners called, but Mr. Ruck was out. If the patients are out the commissioners do not see them. On February 22nd, 1858, Dr. Nairn and Mr. Lutwidge visited him, and expressed an opinion that he laboured as strong as possible under the same delusions with respect to his wife. On May 13th, Mr. Wilks and Mr. Campbell visited him, and expressed an opinion that he still entertained the delusions. On August 19th, the com-

missioners again paid a visit to him, but in consequence of this commission they would not enter into the case. The commissioners see patients about four times a year. The last time Mr. Ruck expressed his delusions was about a week after I made my affidavit on June 14th. I keep a "case book," but I have not got it with me. I do not know I made any entry of that. I should think there were entries in that book showing that he entertained those delusions which justified me in keeping him. I believe that he takes due and proper care of the money allowed him. I might have said that he was as sensible in business matters as any other man. Since I have heard a more correct history of the case I have altered the opinion I expressed in the certificate under which I keep him, that the state of Mr. Ruck, was owing to the abuse of intoxicating drinks. I understand he did not drink. I cannot say when I altered my opinion. I never saw him under the influence of drink but once, and that was when he was taken out to dinner by Mr. Fisher. It has taken some time to alter the opinion. It may be within a month, or perhaps two. It was not in consequence of this commission. I have had several cases of excitement in my asylum, and cured them.

Re-examined by Mr. SERJEANT BALLANTINE: The commissioners attend the asylum without giving any notice. I was educated as a physician, and my uncle kept the asylum before myself. When a person is suffering from drink, we do not leave off stimulants suddenly, but they are allowed wine and beer. If Mr. Ruck had been sane, he would have said he was sorry that he had entertained such delusions, but instead of that he declined to speak on the subject.

By the MASTER: I have known cases where the patients have not been able to control their minds as to the delusions. The last time I tested his mind was June 21; I have tried since, but failed.

By the JURY: The difference between delirium tremens and insanity is that in the one the delusions depart, but in insanity they do not.

By the MASTER: On Sunday last, and I think also on Monday I spoke to him on the subject, but he refused to have anything to say to me, unless in the presence of his lawyer.

Mr. Thomas Weller, examined by Mr. VAUGHAN: I have been assistant at Moorcroft House for 16 or 17 years. I remember Mr. Ruck wishing to have an interview with me. That was in March. He began by telling me of Mrs. Ruck's infidelity. He said he had ocular demonstration of it at Welchpool. He said during the night he saw her beckon to the men, and they said "Hush, he is not yet asleep." He said he saw her drinking with the men, and talking obscenity. He said that the people at the railway station spoke about her disgusting behaviour, and pitying him, saying if they were Mr. Ruck they would get rid of such a wife. At Reading he

said he was sure Mr. Barnett had criminal conversation with his wife, and wanted to poison him. On the next day he went over the same ground again, and I remonstrated with him. He said to me, "I see it is of no use speaking to you, you are like the rest." Mr. Wainwright had interviews with Mr. Ruck, and one day, after he had been some hours with Mr. Wainwright, he asked who he was, and said he was thrust on him by Mr. Fisher.

Richard Brown, the attendant on Mr. Ruck since January, frequently walked out with him. Mr. Ruck said his wife, his mother, and Mr. Barnett had tried to poison him. He would go out of his way two miles to avoid red petticoats. The witness corroborated the other witnesses with regard to Mr. Ruck's allegations of his wife's infidelity and prostitution.

Mr. Ruck was then called. His face was flushed, but he did not appear excited.

In answer to the MASTER, he said he had heard the evidence, and was not excited by it. He wished to add that at the time the delusions came over him, he was in a confused and agitated state of mind; and he was caught up and placed in an asylum before he had time to investigate whether his delusions and suspicions were well founded. His excitement was brought on by drink. He had not seen his wife since February till yesterday.

MASTER: And were you happy to see her? *Mr. Ruck*: I was happy to see her looking so well.

Your mind is now disabused of all the impressions against your wife?—Quite so.

Can you explain to the jury how you came to take up with them?—In the state I was in I thought I heard the coachman say he had placed his hand upon my wife. I was excited by drink at the time. I have not been so since, except on Monday last, when I was a little excited. I should have got rid of the delusions before had they not been revived by Dr. Stillwell. But I wished to get the facts cleared up.

And have they been cleared up?—Yes.

Who cleared them up for you?—Mr. Wainwright.

What steps has he taken?—Quite sufficient to show me that my delusions were only the work of imagination; I require no further investigation.

In reply to various questions, he added that one fact was that the gentleman who came in the coach with them to Welchpool did not come in the morning. He pointed out that there was a discrepancy in the evidence of Mr. Barnett and Mr. Thurston about the pistol. His remarks about what occurred at the railway station were also untrue. He fancied that he heard voices; but, knowing that he must be mistaken, he now thought no more about them.

When did Mr. Wainwright make his communication to you?—On the 14th of June last. I have not seen Miss Jones since I saw her at my house. I never saw her two children. I suppose they

are living. I locked her up because she was drunk. My wife said she would serve me as I had served her, but I never suspected her of infidelity. A great deal of what it is said I charged her with I have no recollection of saying.

How was it that, your mind having been disabused for several weeks, you did not seek your wife? It was no use. She was acting under the advice of the doctors, and would not see me.

He further stated that the books which he tore up were books on midwifery, with plates, and others on the venereal disease. He explained several other points of the case, and said that Thurston was a notorious liar. He never suspected Thurston or Barnett of misconduct with his wife.

In reply to a jurior, he stated that he had on several occasions expressed sorrow and regret at having made these unfounded charges against his wife.

He was then questioned with regard to his property, and he said that he had altogether about 1500*l* a year, and as to his having wasted money in seeking for slate mines, he said that all he had expended in this way was about 50*l*., and he did this upon the reports of competent persons, who assured him there was a probability of slate being discovered. He had expended 500*l*. upon a quarry upon his estate, and that had turned out a very good operation.

Dr. Sutherland was then examined.—He said that he had an interview with Mr. Ruck on May the 19th, and on one other occasion on June the 9th. He had previously been furnished with the history of his delusions. At the first meeting Mr. Ruck refused to enter into communication with a stranger. Witness was introduced to him as Dr. Sutherland by Dr. Stillwell. On the 9th of June he again saw him, and told him that he had made inquiries and found there were differences of opinion, and that he (witness) regarded it in the light of a tragedy. The moment witness said this, Mr. Ruck said that he must hear his story. He then said that a commercial traveller, named Peach, had insisted upon getting inside the mail coach as he and his wife were going to Welchpool, and that he had ascertained that he had travelled with his wife and child on the previous day, and that when his wife saw Peach she said she would come to him, and this was a convincing proof of her infidelity. He then said that upon arriving at Moorcroft he found there was a patient named Peach there, and he thought he was the brother of the commercial traveller, and that his wife had placed him there. Mr. Ruck also told him that he thought Mary Jones had murdered her two children, and the reason for his thinking so was that she was sleeping with a commercial traveller in the next room; he said that if she did not satisfy him (Mr. Ruck) she would swing for it. Mary Jones, he then said, came to his bed and laid down by his side and said, "Dearest Lawrence." Mr. Ruck entered into various details as to what occurred at

Welchpool, and he said that his wife had had criminal connection with one of the men who was set to watch him, and that the other man was looking on at the time. Mr. Ruck also told him that his wife's conduct was quite notorious, and he had heard people remark while he was on a journey with her, "How strange—there goes a lady who bilked her husband." He also said that at Stafford a drover, who was on the platform, addressed his wife, and said "Mary Anne, come to me;" and another drover made a disgusting observation respecting his wife. He then said that when he was at Mr. Barnett's, Mr. Barnett and his wife drank sherry, and passed some port to him, and after he had tasted it he felt that he was not safe, and left the house. He also told him that he observed something like corrosive sublimate round the edge of the tea cup, and after tasting the tea he would not drink any more of it, and he said that something was put upon his bread and butter, which he put in his portmanteau to have it analysed. He then said that he believed Mary Jones had murdered his children, and he should have the matter investigated. The witness expressed his opinion that from all he observed he had no doubt that at this time Mr. Ruck was insane, and he said he agreed with Dr. Stillwell that while these impressions remained upon his mind it would be very dangerous to allow him to be at large. He had heard Mr. Ruck deny that this conversation had taken place, and the course of his experience went to show that persons who had delusions if they were tutored would sometimes deny having those delusions, but under ordinary circumstances the questioning of a person who had delusions upon the subject would be to bring them out at once. Witness considered that Mr. Ruck was very much better now than he was in June, but still he considered that it would be very dangerous to set him at large.

Cross-examined: It was a symptom of mania to tear up old clothes (a laugh).

Mr. JAMES: Then tearing up an old coat is a symptom of mania?

The *Witness* said that tearing up old clothes was always considered a proof of mania. Dr. Stillwell gave him "the key," as it was termed, of his delusions, and mentioned that he believed he was possessed of large property in mines, and that he believed it to be much larger than it really was. Witness first went to see Mr. Ruck at the request of Dr. Stillwell. Witness was of opinion that the insanity of Mr. Ruck was in a great measure to be attributed to excessive drinking. He had not seen Mr. Ruck since June. His malady was one that was certainly curable, but if he were to be at large, and were to drink to excess again, he would be very liable to a relapse. Mr. Ruck never told him that he had actually seen his wife commit an act of infidelity. A good deal depended upon the moral treatment of a patient who was labouring under delusions of this character, and it was very important that an opportunity should be afforded to the party to make inquiry, in

order to satisfy him that there was no ground for his delusions, and that the cure very much depended upon this being done.

Mr. JAMES then inquired whether preventing a man from having communication with his friends and making inquiries was not very much calculated to prevent the delusions from being dispelled.

Dr. Sutherland for some time declined to give a direct answer to this question, and he at length said he thought it would have been better if the inquiry had taken place sooner.

Re-examined: Witness was not aware of any proceedings having been taken by Mrs. Ruck, or any other person, to prevent this inquiry from taking place at an earlier period.

Dr. Forbes Winslow was the next witness. He said that he saw Mr. Ruck on the 9th of May, in the garden of Moorcroft House, and walked about with him. It was a long time before he could make any reference to the subject of his delusions; and after about an hour had elapsed he said he would make a clean breast of it. He then said that the conduct of his wife had been so disgraceful that he could not forgive it. Witness suggested that he might be mistaken in his notions, but he said he was not, and said that her conduct had been such that he could never live with her again. He then said he had no doubt there was an improper intimacy between Mr. Barnett and his wife, and that the railway officials and the stable boys all knew of his wife's misconduct, and that in point of fact she was nothing better than a common prostitute. *Dr. Winslow* concluded by stating that he had no doubt those ideas were the result of a distempered fancy, and from all he had heard he did not believe those delusions had altogether passed away from his mind. It was a very common occurrence for lunatics to conceal their delusions, and he knew of a case where he had examined a patient who had many dangerous delusions for three days, and he told him that he knew they were delusions, and he was sorry that he had ever entertained them, and he prayed to be set at large, and by witness's advice he was set at liberty; and within three days he was found with a carving knife secreted up his sleeve, and with an evident intention to do mischief to some person. In his opinion Mr. Ruck ought not to be set at large, but he thought he ought to be placed under different treatment, and to have much more liberty afforded to him than he enjoyed at present.

Cross-examined: Mr. Ruck was certainly much better now than he was in June. He was the proprietor of an asylum similar to Moorcroft House, and had had great experience in matters of this kind; and he certainly considered that where a man was labouring under delusions it was not an improper proceeding to prevent him from having communication with his friends.

Re-examined: Some cases of delirium tremens are almost incurable. He did not think that the delusions of Mr. Ruck were quite gone at the present moment.

By the MASTER: From all I have heard, I am of opinion

that the delusions still, to a certain extent, remain upon his mind; and I should not like to incur the responsibility of ordering him to be set at large. I think he ought to have as much liberty as is consistent with his personal safety, and I believe that in time he may entirely recover.

Dr. Connolly was re-called and examined: He said—I have heard the statement Mr. Ruck has made to-day, and it has only modified my opinion. I think that he is better, but I expected after his hearing what I stated yesterday as to the symptoms of cure, that he would have denied that he still entertained any of these delusions.

Mr. Ruck was here re-called, and at the suggestion of Mr. James he was asked whether he had cut up the coat and shawl, and he denied having done so, and he said he did not know by whom it was done, unless it was done by Miss Jones.

Serjeant Ballantine then proceeded to give a most able summing up of the case in support of the petition, and he urged that there was abundant evidence at all events to show that it would be highly dangerous at the present moment to trust Mr. Ruck with his liberty, and that he certainly ought for some time longer to be kept under wholesome and mild restraint.

The following evidence was then taken on the part of Mr. Ruck:—

Mr. Fisher examined by Mr. PETERSDORFF: I am a member of the bar. I married a sister of Mr. Ruck. I have stopped for a month together, and have had good opportunities of watching the conduct of Mr. and Mrs. Ruck. Mr. Ruck was a very temperate man. He saw no change of mind in 1851, 1853, or 1855. I had some conversation with him about the value of his mines. I went down one of them. I should say they were of great value. He did not appear to express exaggerated remarks about the mines. He used to bring up samples. In August, 1857, he spoke about joining Mr. Taylor. The value of these mines was the subject of repeated conversations between us all. I thought he looked better than ever when I saw him in August, 1857. The first intimation I had that he was insane was on the 5th of November, when Mr. Gore had letters on the subject. I was surprised to hear that he had been locked up, and expressed my extreme displeasure to Mrs. Ruck and Mr. Barnett. I went to Moorcroft two days afterwards. I saw Dr. Stillwell, and I applied to see Mr. Ruck. He refused to allow me to have an interview with him. I told him who I was. He said he would allow me to see him, and I saw him in the garden from a bed-room window. I inquired the cause of his being there, and Dr. Stillwell said he was labouring under delirium tremens, and it might be unfavourable to Mr. Ruck if I spoke to him. I went again on the Monday following, the 9th. Mrs. Fisher was with me. Dr. Stillwell was out at the time, and we waited some time till he came in. Dr. Stillwell said we should see

him, but we were on no account to speak to him on matters touching his state. Mr. Ruck came into the room, and appeared as cheerful and well as ever he did. He spoke in quite a natural manner, and asked after several members of his family.

Then you did not observe anything in his manner that would lead you to suppose that his mind was in any way affected? I saw nothing that would indicate anything of the kind.

You did not speak to him as to his condition?—No, I did not. I was guided by what Dr. Stillwell said of him. I saw Mr. Ruck again in April. Mrs. Fisher was with me. Dr. Stillwell said we should see him and form our opinion. Mr. Ruck complained of his family leaving him, and inquired about what Mr. Ockworth had done. He said that he must get out of the place. Dr. Barnett and his wife had placed him there, and he wished that something might be done to get him out of the asylum. I mentioned that I would bring Mr. Wainwright down, and that inquiries should be made. On the following day I went to the asylum, and introduced Mr. Wainwright. Mr. Ruck went into a narrative of his coming from the country, and being met by his wife. He directed Mr. Wainwright to have the opinion of a physician, and to take proceedings to effect his liberation. I do not think I saw Mr. Ruck again at the asylum. On the 9th of June I received a letter from Dr. Stillwell, refusing me admission to see Mr. Ruck. I had previously applied at the asylum. I saw him in July, when he was before the Lords Justices. He was very intelligent and rational. He did not allude to Mrs. Ruck, nor did I.

You have been with him the last few days?—Yes; I have been staying at the hotel with him, and he appears quite an emancipated man.

Have you spoken to him about these delusions?—I have and he said they had entirely left him. He never thought of them. Mr. Wainwright had fully satisfied him that they were delusions, and they now never entered his mind.

Then you think he is fit to govern his own affairs?—I do. It would be an act of cruelty to confine him longer. It would drive him mad.

Cross-examined: I was told that Mr. Ruck charged his wife with infidelity. He told me that he had some suspicion that his wife had been intimate with Mr. Barnett. Heard said that he thought Mr. Barnett had put poison in his port wine. I told him that there was not the least ground for his suspicions. He said this was the first time he had had an opportunity of conversing with any of his family, and expressed himself that his suspicions must be unfounded.

Re-examined: He was anxious for an inquiry.

By a JUROR: He said that we had some difficulty in posting letters from the asylum.

By the MASTER: Mr. Ruck has a brother who had visited him.

Dr. Stillwell recalled: I wrote the entry in the case (asylum) book respecting Mr. Ruck—"There is a hereditary predisposition to insanity in the family," from what was stated in the certificate.

The witness was then questioned as to other statements contained in the report of the case, some of which were that he had spent large sums of money in sinking pits to work for ore upon his estate, and that he had threatened to shoot his wife's sister, and he said that he had made these statements upon the information furnished by Mr. Barnett and other persons.

Mrs. Sarah Fisher, the wife of the last witness, and sister of the alleged lunatic, deposed that she had five sisters and brothers. Her father was dead. She never observed anything eccentric in his conduct, or that he had any predisposition to insanity. She never heard of such a thing till she heard the statement of Mrs. Ruck. She said she had frequent opportunities, of course, of seeing her brother, and never observed any violence in his conduct, or heard of his acting in a violent manner. She had always understood that her brother's mines and quarries were valuable, and she frequently conversed with him upon the subject. The witness then proceeded to corroborate the statement of her husband as to what took place when they went to visit Mr. Ruck at the asylum. She also stated that in her opinion her brother was at the present time quite sensible and rational, and in the same condition he always had been.

Mrs. Ruck, the mother of the alleged lunatic, was the next witness. She merely proved that there had been no insanity in the family.

Mr. Wainwright was then examined. He deposed that he acted as solicitor for Mr. Ruck in these proceedings. He had no knowledge of him before the 7th of last November, when Mr. Fisher, whom he had known for several years, made a communication to him, and he accompanied him to Moorcroft House. Dr. Stillwell showed him the medical certificates, and assigned as a reason for their not being permitted to communicate with him, that he was labouring under delirium tremens. He subsequently had an interview with Mr. Ruck, and ascertained what his delusion was with regard to what had occurred in the mail coach with Mr. Peach, and the other matters which had been referred to. Dr. Seymour accompanied him, and conversed with Mr. Ruck, and it turned out that one of the supposed delusions that a governess had had two children by him, and also his opinions upon the subject of his slate quarries, were not delusions at all, but facts. Mr. Weller had previously stated that these were two of the delusions upon which the opinion of the insanity of Mr. Ruck was supposed to be founded. Mr. Weller stated that the third delusion was that Mr. Ruck had seen his wife commit a criminal act in the mail coach, and Mr. Ruck interposed and denied having said that he saw it, and said that he had merely suspected it. Witness then said that it would be very improper to keep him

longer in the asylum, and that Dr. Seymour recommended he should be immediately set at liberty. He afterwards communicated with Mrs. Ruck, and strongly advised her to keep the matter from the knowledge of the public. She then intimated that she did not think she should ever live with Mr. Ruck again, and something was said about a settlement. Mr. Williams, who acted as solicitor for Mrs. Ruck, subsequently communicated with Mr. Ruck and saw him again, and then informed him that Mrs. Ruck had made up her mind not to live with her husband again, and that this must be the basis of any arrangement that was come to. Mr. Wainwright said that he endeavoured to do all that was possible to effect an amicable settlement, and to avoid the necessity of publicity, but he was told he must concede the fact that Mr. Ruck was insane, and this he refused to do, and the endeavour to effect an arrangement consequently came to nothing, and he went on with the necessary proceedings to effect the release of Mr. Ruck. He saw him at the asylum on the 12th and 19th of May, and on the latter day he told him of his delusions respecting his wife, but he appeared to treat them as suspicions rather than facts, and he wished witness to go to Welchpool and make inquiries. Witness asked him to give him an order upon his brother-in-law, Mr. Goord, for the money to pay the necessary expenses, and pen, ink, and paper were sent for, but Dr. Stillwell came into the room, and said he could not allow Mr. Ruck to sign any order for money. Mrs. Ruck was in the asylum at the time, and she also said that an order for money should be given, and if Mr. Ruck signed any order upon Mr. Goord, he would not pay it. He went again to see Mr. Ruck on the 25th of May, but he was not permitted to do so, as he understood, by the direction of Mrs. Ruck, and he was compelled to threaten to apply to the Court before he was allowed to see him again. Mr. Ruck then requested him to go into the country, and make inquiries upon the subject of his suspicions, and he gave him the names of persons to whom he said he ought to apply for information, and gave him also letters of introduction. He accordingly went to Welchpool and other places, and upon his return he told him that he had ascertained that he was very drunk all the time, and that there was not the slightest foundation for the suspicions he had entertained of his wife. Mr. Ruck appeared perfectly satisfied with his explanation, and exclaimed, "What a fool I must have been!" At this time the commission was very shortly coming on for hearing, and he advised Mr. Ruck not to speak to any one about his delusions except in the presence of himself or some medical man. He concluded by expressing an opinion that Mr. Ruck was now perfectly sane.

Mr. Wainwright was cross-examined at very considerable length, but nothing very material was elicited from him. He said that in his opinion Mr. Ruck never had been insane. He denied that he had made a suggestion that Mr. Ruck should be placed in a

cottage, and that Dr. Seymour should attend upon him, but he said that something of the kind he believed was mentioned by Mr. Williams, or some other person. It appeared that he was compelled to apply to the Lords Justices in order to obtain money for the costs of opposing the commission, and that Mr. Goord was eventually directed to pay a sum of 250*l.* out of the alleged lunatic's funds for that purpose. Mr. Ruck insisted upon his telling him everything he did when he went into the country to make inquiries, and the names of the persons he spoke to. He had no doubt that Mr. Ruck was in a very drunken and excited state during the journey to Welchpool, and he learned that fact from every one who saw him during the period.

Mr. Robert Jones deposed that he resided near Aberdovey, and was acquainted with Mr. Ruck, but not intimately. He was a director of a railway in that neighbourhood, and he attended some meetings in August last, at which witness, who was also a director, was present. He did not observe anything material in his proceedings; and, from what he observed, he was perfectly sane at that time. He was aware that Mr. Ruck had a stone quarry upon his estate, and he frequently spoke about it.

Cross-examined: Believed Mr. Ruck had 100 shares in the undertaking of 10*l.* each, and that he had paid 3*l.* upon each share. He was sorry to say their share list was rather low (a laugh).

Mr. Robert Hughes, a quarryman, proved that he was instructed by Mr. Ruck in July of last year, to inspect some quarries belonging to him. He did so, and made a report upon the subject.

The report was put in and read. It was to the effect that the prospects of the quarry were favourable, and that it might be worked to great advantage.

The witness added, that in his opinion the place was not properly worked, and that there were many things very favourable to an outlay of capital.

Cross-examined: It would require an outlay of about 150*l.* to give the place a fair trial. He believed about 400*l.* had been already expended.

Mr. W. Owen, a surgeon of Machynlleth, deposed that he saw Mr. Ruck, at the Eagle Hotel, in October. He was in a very excited state, and was walking about with a bottle of wine in his hand. He considered that he was at this time suffering from the effects of drink.

Cross-examined: He had a share in some land which he sold to Mr. Ruck. He sold it to him for 100*l.* The sum he originally gave for it was 5*l.*

George Randell, who was formerly one of the attendants at Moorcroft, deposed that Mr. Ruck was placed in his charge. He remembered his being brought in, and he attended upon him for three months, and slept in the same room with him. They also

went fox-hunting and stag-hunting together. He used to make reports of his conduct, and both Dr. Stillwell and Mr. Weller said they could not see much the matter with him. Upon one occasion Mrs. Ruck came to see her husband, and Dr. Stilwell told him to listen at the door, and hear what occurred. He did so, and he took her (a laugh) very kindly, and they seemed very affectionate. They used to give him emetics occasionally in his tea, and on one occasion another patient got the emetic instead of him—(a laugh). In witness's opinion he was as sane as any gentleman now in the room. Dr. Stillwell once said that he was going on nicely. This was not after he had taken an emetic. Witness was directed not to allow Mr. Ruck to post any letter, but after he left he told him he would "open the ball" for him, and he took the letter to Mr. Ackworth, his solicitor.

Cross-examined: He was paid 10s. a week at the asylum, and he had his board besides. When Mr. Ruck first came in, he took him to some of his friends, and they said they could not see anything in him—(a laugh). He took Mr. Ruck to his aunt, and he behaved like any other gentleman; he took a glass of wine, and had some cake—(laughter).

Re-examined: In the first instance witness had orders not to allow Mr. Ruck to post a letter to any one, not even to his wife. No patient was allowed to be seen by his friends or relations until he was first seen by the physician of the establishment.

Thomas Randell, also formerly an attendant at the asylum, deposed that he was discharged in consequence of Dr. Stillwell suspecting that he had posted a letter from Mr. Ruck. He had previously told him not to post any letters for Mr. Ruck, or else he said the lawyers would be at work. Mr. Ruck frequently walked about the meadow with him, and he used to say that he was very anxious to have his case investigated.

Dr. H. Tuke was then called. He said that he had been eleven years proprietor of a lunatic asylum at Chiswick, and had had great experience in the treatment of lunatics. He had seen Mr. Ruck upon three occasions, and he believed he was now perfectly sane. In his opinion, he had been suffering from mania occasioned by drinking. A man in such a condition was subject to delusions, and the best way to remove these delusions would be to give him an opportunity for investigation to satisfy his mind. In the case of madness arising from drink, he was of opinion that it was not an advisable course to place the patient in an asylum.

Cross-examined: He had three interviews with Mr. Ruck, on the 9th, 14th, and 21st of August. One of them lasted for two hours. He said he had been jealous of his wife, and he appeared to think he had some cause, and explained that he and his wife had not lived very happily; and that his wife told him that if she caught him intriguing with other women, she would revenge herself by acting in the same way with other men.

By *Mr. James* : The manner in which *Mr. Ruck* stated to me that his illusions were dispelled satisfied me that such was the case.

Dr. Seymour, formerly a commissioner of lunacy, deposed that he saw *Mr. Ruck* first on the 21st of April, and he visited him also upon two other occasions ; from all he had heard, and from his own observation, he had no doubt that *Mr. Ruck's* was a case of drunken madness ; and it appeared to him that the proper way to have treated him was by gentle care at home, and that he ought never to have been sent to a lunatic asylum. He was aware of the nature of the delusions he entertained, and at the two last interviews he conversed with him for a long time upon the subject, and he was satisfied that they had now entirely passed away, and that he was in a perfectly sound state of mind, and that it would be worse than a hardship to send him back to the asylum.

Cross-examined : If *Mr. Ruck* were again to addict himself to intemperate habits the malady would doubtless return, but if he abstained from drink it was very probable that he would enjoy better health than he had ever done in his life after this attack.

Mr. Skey, one of the senior surgeons at *St. Bartholomew's Hospital* gave similar evidence, and he also expressed a positive opinion that it was a case of madness from drink, and that the delusions under which *Mr. Ruck's* mind had been labouring had now entirely passed away.

Mr. Lawrence, senior surgeon at *St. Bartholomew's* gave the same evidence, and stated that in his opinion *Mr. Ruck* was of perfectly sound mind at the present moment.

In answer to a question put by *Mr. CHAMBERS*, *Mr. Lawrence* said he could hardly express an opinion that it would be advisable at once to set *Mr. Ruck* at liberty and make him an entirely free agent, because if he were to drink to any extent his malady would no doubt return, and dangerous consequences might result.

By *Mr. JAMES* : Witness had no doubt whatever that at this moment *Mr. Ruck* was in a perfectly sound state of mind.

Dr. Copland gave similar evidence.

Mr. Gay, senior surgeon to the *Great Northern Hospital* and *Idiot Asylum*, and *Dr. Johnson*, physician to *King's College Hospital* gave similar evidence. They both expressed their opinion that it was a case of drunken madness, such as might have been speedily cured by the patient being kept quiet and debarred from intoxicating liquors. They also said that there were cases where a patient had the cunning to conceal his delusions, and to make it appear that they no longer existed ; but they expressed a positive opinion that this was not the case with *Mr. Ruck*, and that his mind was now completely recovered.

Mr. Wainwright was recalled by the request of the Master and he stated that it was on the 28th of May that *Mr. Ruck* first requested him to make inquiries, but he was not allowed to see him for some time, and he did not go into the country to make inquiries

until the 12th of July. When his delusions were dispelled, he asked witness what he had better do, and he told him that under ordinary circumstances the proper course would be to communicate with his wife ; but as this was a peculiar case, he could not advise him without consideration, and he afterwards told him he thought he had better not communicate with the doctor or any one else, except in his presence, or that of some independent medical man. The delusions were present to his mind undoubtedly down to the period when he gave him the information that there was no foundation for them.

By the JURY: His object in giving this advice was that no advantage should be taken of him, and that some one should be present to hear what actually took place.

The MASTER then proceeded to sum up the evidence, and he said that the only question the jury had to consider was whether at this moment Mr. Ruck was of sound mind and competent to manage his own affairs, and to protect his own interests, or whether he was of unsound mind and incompetent to do so. He would observe that they ought not to allow any prejudices of a popular kind to interfere in any manner with their decision ; and he felt assured that they would give their verdict upon the evidence that had been laid before them, and upon that alone. They had nothing whatever to do with the question whether Mr. Ruck had been confined legally or illegally ; and all they were called upon to do was to say by their verdict whether, at this moment, Mr. Ruck was or was not of sound mind. The present was, undoubtedly, a very painful case, and no one could help feeling commiseration for the unhappy lady who had been compelled to institute these proceedings ; and it was impossible to doubt that she had been actuated by kind and affectionate feelings, and that it was solely under the advice of Dr. Conolly that her husband was sent to this asylum, which, from all he had heard, appeared to have been a very well regulated one. He then said that he considered it quite unnecessary to read the evidence that had been given, because he was quite sure that it must be fresh in their recollection, and he should, therefore, at once leave the matter in their hands and ask them to return their verdict.

When the MASTER had concluded, some of the jury expressed a wish to put a few questions to Mr. Ruck. He was then asked what object he had in wishing to bring his pistols to town on Monday last, and he said that Mr. Wainwright told him to do so in order that the jury might see them, and that they were out of repair. He denied most positively having stated that when he was refused permission he said, it was that confounded Barnett and his wife again. He then declared that the delusions with regard to his wife and Mr. Barnett and others had entirely left him, and that they never had any foundation, but they were the result of a disordered imagination. He added, that he should have communicated with

his wife the moment his mind was restored but he was annoyed at her having instituted the commission of lunacy. In answer to other questions he stated that his children were good children, and he entertained great affection for them, and the reason he had not written to them was that he did not like them to know he was in such a place, but he should go to them immediately he was able to do so.

The Jury retired at a quarter-past three o'clock, and in about ten minutes they returned into court and declared that they were of opinion that Mr. Ruck was of sound mind and competent to manage his affairs.

The number in favour of this verdict was twelve, and there were six dissentients.

The Newspaper Attack on Private Lunatic Asylums.

The above reported inquisitions have created a storm of indignation in the newspaper press, which cannot fail to be of the utmost interest to the members of our Association, first, as a psychological phenomenon ; and, secondly, as an event which may possibly have some influence upon future legislation.

As a psychological phenomenon, the general indignation of our newspaper contemporaries, has doubtless in great measure been due to that wonderful law of emotional imitation which sets mobs of men crying, or laughing, or yelling, or fighting in discordant concert. The mob of newspaper writers in the dullest season have suddenly started game, upon which they could all run, and like a scratch pack they have opened their sweet melodious voices upon the poor mad doctor ; and a scratch pack it was indeed, with every intonation of threatening cry, from the noble bay of the hound, to the small yap of the cur. It is a wonderful thing this newspaper press of ours, the fifth estate as it is called, the bulwark of right, the palladium of liberty, the great engine of education, the universal instructor of the people in all that is right, and we must add in all that is wrong, the fountain of the pure waters of truth, but alas, sometimes also the sewer of calumnious falsehood. If there is one kind of writing in which the newspaper press is peculiarly powerful it is the vituperative. Reasoning is tedious work, and a comprehensive