

Medico-legal observations upon infantile leucorrhoea / William Robert Wills Wilde.

Contributors

Wilde, W. R. 1815-1876.
University of Glasgow. Library

Publication/Creation

London : printed by William Tyler, 1853.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/kzwbjmn4>

Provider

University of Glasgow

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The University of Glasgow Library. The original may be consulted at The University of Glasgow Library. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

92.13.5

MEDICO-LEGAL OBSERVATIONS

UPON

Infantile Leucorrhœa,

ARISING OUT OF THE

ALLEGED CASES OF FELONIOUS ASSAULTS
ON YOUNG CHILDREN,

RECENTLY TRIED IN DUBLIN.

BY

W. R. WILDE, F.R.C.S.

SURGEON TO ST. MARK'S HOSPITAL, ETC. ETC.

"A multitude of persons have been hanged by such a mistake."

SIR ASTLEY COOPER.

LONDON :

JOHN CHURCHILL, PRINCE'S-STREET, SOHO.

DUBLIN: FANNIN AND CO.

THE MEDICAL OBSERVATIONS

OF THE

ALLEGED CASES OF EXHAUSTION
ON THE CHINESE

BY

W. R. WILKES, ESQ.
OF THE

THE

LONDON
JOHN GURNELL, PRINTER, ST. MARTIN'S LANE
1841

TO
MAJOR LARCOM, R.E.

UNDER SECRETARY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT OF
IRELAND, ETC. ETC.

WHOSE KNOWLEDGE OF LITERATURE AND APPRECIATION OF SCIENCE,

WILL ENABLE HIM TO

UNDERSTAND AND ESTIMATE THE MEDICAL OPINIONS

CONTAINED IN THE FOLLOWING PAGES;

WHILE HIS LOVE OF JUSTICE WILL, NO DOUBT,

INDUCE HIM TO DIRECT MEASURES TO BE TAKEN

FOR THE ELUCIDATION OF TRUTH

IN CASES SIMILAR TO THOSE HEREIN RELATED,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED

BY

HIS ADMIRING FRIEND,

THE AUTHOR.

MALCOLM KOLM

THE AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE
JEWISH PEOPLE

WITH A FOREWORD BY THE AUTHOR

TRANSLATED BY

THEODORE H. GORDON

CONTAINS THE HISTORY OF THE

JEWISH PEOPLE FROM THE

EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT

FOR THE STUDENT OF THE

JEWISH HISTORY

THE BOOK IS

BY

THE AUTHOR

THE AUTHOR

INTRODUCTION.

THE crime of rape is one of the gravest offences which can be committed against society, public morals, or an individual. All civilised nations, from the days of the early Israelites down to the present time, have marked their detestation of it by enacting the severest punishments against the offenders. Sir Matthew Hale said it was an accusation "easy to be made, harder to prove, but harder to be defended by the party accused;" the value of which aphorism will appear in the pages of the following pamphlet. From the time of Queen Elizabeth to the present, various authorities—jurists, physicians, and moralists—have questioned the possibility of consummating the crime of rape upon the adult female. This is not the place to discuss that question; but, that accusations of rape are, in the country parts of Ireland, brought forward almost daily, by females who have cohabited with men, or are at the time pregnant by them, in order to procure a marriage, every magistrate is aware;—and that such cases are tried at every assizes, particularly in the south and west, and form,

if not the most profitable portion of the fees, the most amusing pastime of the bar, every lawyer is aware. Not many years ago a clergyman was, in such cases, usually in attendance to perform the ceremony of marriage in the dock, should the trial take an unfavourable turn towards the prisoner. The records of crimes afforded either by lawyers or medical jurisprudents, show but very few cases indeed of false accusation, so far, at least, as the physical act is concerned.

Owing to the depravity of human nature, or from other circumstances detailed in the following pages, men have been found base enough to have connexion with mere children, who have neither the power to resist nor the sense to understand the nature of the crime committed upon them. The law, therefore, wisely and justly defines the committal of a crime of this nature upon a child under ten years of age, even with her consent, as a felony equal in enormity with rape, and punishable by transportation for life. When an offence of this nature is committed, the evidence is generally incontrovertible, and the prisoner seldom escapes the just vengeance of the law. Some years ago, a soldier, in the county Tipperary, perpetrated the crime upon an infant not two years old, but it was discovered a few hours after it was committed. During the past year a case was tried at Limerick, in which a man attempted to commit a felonious assault upon a little

girl, with whom he was put to sleep (a practice too common in this country); but the cries of the child having attracted attention, he was immediately arrested, and eventually convicted. Similar cases present themselves from time to time. Fortunately for the cause of justice, the annals of crime or of courts of justice in this country do not afford a single instance in which, either owing to the adroitness of the prisoner's advocate, the hairsplitting of medical testimony, or the breaking down of the infantile accuser, the accused has escaped unpunished, where the crime really had been committed.

It frequently happens that children are forced, by threats of the severest punishments, such as one would imagine belonged only to the age of torture—of the rack and the thumbscrew,—to make accusations against innocent individuals; not for the purpose of extortion, or the gratification of revenge, but at the instigation of their parents or guardians, who themselves labour under a popular delusion, in which they are supported by a few ignorant medical men, by the police, and by the public Crown prosecutors. The following impressive and graphic statement of Sir Astley Cooper is so apposite to this description of case, that I here insert it, in preference to any observations of my own:

“There is a circumstance which I am exceedingly anxious to dwell on—I allude to a discharge from young

females; and *I hope there is not one here this evening but will be strongly impressed with the importance of the subject.* Children, from one year old, and even under, up to the age of puberty, are frequently the subject of a purulent discharge from the pudendum, chiefly originating beneath the preputium clitoridis: the nymphæ, orifice of the vagina, and the meatus urinarius, are in an inflamed state, and pour out a discharge. The bed-linen and rest of the clothes are marked by it. It now and then happens to a nervous woman, to be alarmed at such an appearance, and she suspects her child of having acted in an improper manner; and perhaps, not quite clear herself, she is more ready to suspect others, and says, ‘Dear me (if she confesses), it is something like what I have had myself.’ She goes to a medical man, who may, unfortunately, not be aware of the nature of the complaint I am speaking of, and he says, ‘Good God! your child has got the clap.’ (A laugh.) A mistake of this kind, gentlemen, is no laughing matter; and though I am glad to make you smile sometimes, and like to join you in your smiles, I cannot do it on the present occasion, for it is too serious a matter. *I can assure you, a multitude of persons have been hanged by such a mistake.* I will tell you exactly what takes place in such cases: the mother goes home, and says to the child, ‘Who is it that has been playing with you? Who has

taken you on his knee lately?' The child innocently replies, 'No one, mother; nobody has, I declare to you.' The mother then says, 'Oh, don't tell me such stories; *I will flog you if you do.*' And thus the child is driven to confess what never happened, in order to save herself from being chastised. At last she says, 'Such a one has taken me on his lap.' The person is questioned, and firmly denies it; but the child, *owing to the mother's threats, persists in what she has said.* The man is brought into a court of justice; *a surgeon, who is ignorant of the nature of the discharge I am now speaking about, gives his evidence, and the man suffers for that which he never committed.* The mother is persuaded, if there be a slight ulceration in the parts, that violence has been used, and a rape committed; she immediately says, 'What a horrid villain must he be for forcing a child to such an unnatural crime, and communicating to her such a horrible disease! I should be glad to see him hanged!'^{*}

"If I were to tell you how often I have met with such cases, I should say that I have met with thirty in the course of my life. The last case I saw was in the city: a gentleman came to me, and asked me to see a child with him, who had a gonorrhœa on her. I went, and found

* Expressions almost similar were used in Court by Mr. Cosgrave towards the prisoner, Kane, at one of the late trials in Dublin.

that she had a free discharge from the preputium clitoridis. I said that there was nothing so common as this. There was considerable inflammation, and it had even proceeded to ulceration, which I told him would soon give way to the use of the liquor calcis, with calomel. ‘Do you tell me so? (he replied,) why, suspicion has fallen on one of the servants; but he will not confess. If he had appeared at the Old Bailey, I should have given my evidence against him, for I was not aware of what you have just now told me.’ I told him that if the man had been hanged by his evidence, he would have deserved to be hanged too.*

“I am anxious that this complaint should be known by every one present, and that the remarks I have made should be circulated throughout the kingdom.”—*Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Surgery, by Sir Astley Cooper, Bart.* Sixth Original Edition. London, 1839. Pp. 541, 542.

Some cases of this nature having recently occurred in Dublin, I thought it my duty to publish an account of them in the *London Medical Times and Gazette*; and

* When Sir Astley first delivered his lectures, the punishment of this offence was death. We may, however, still paraphrase the expression, and say, “If the man had been transported, he (the doctor) would have deserved to be transported too.”

[See also a paper by Dr. J. R. Cormack, in the *Edinburgh Monthly Journal* for September, 1844.]

in the hope of preventing a repetition of similar scenes again, and of showing the various persons employed in the getting up of such cases, how to distinguish truth from error, I have, in the following pages, reprinted my communications to that periodical. By this little work it will be seen, that for the last sixty years at least, the disease described by Cooper, and which induced the recent trials in this city, has been perfectly understood by medical men; and that trials arising therefrom are well known to the professors of medical jurisprudence. I dare say, the perusal of this tract will remind both lawyers and doctors of cases similar to those which I have described; of whom the former can remember the trials, and the latter will call to mind the details of those which have occurred in their practice.

[To the medical men who came forward in the cause of truth and justice at the late trials in Dublin; and to the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, who so fully exposed the way in which such cases are "got up," the public are much indebted.]

DUBLIN, 21, WESTLAND-ROW,
1st December, 1853.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Authorities upon Infantile Leucorrhœa	1, 2, 3, 26, 27, 30
Description of the Disease	2, 25
Popular Delusion respecting Gonorrhœa	2, 36
Mode of Getting up the Case	vii., 3, 10
Method of Police Examination	9

THE DUBLIN CASES:—

The Queen v. Tracy	5
The Queen v. Barber	6
The Queen v. Kane	8, 38
The Queen v. Fitton.....	21
Medical Testimony in the Dublin Cases.....	5, 7, 12, 34
Corroborative Evidence	14, 28
Moral Injury Inflicted on Children by the Exposure of such Cases	29

AUTHORITIES:—

Sir Astley Cooper—"Lectures on Surgery"	vii., 1, 2, 29, 31, 38, 39
Mr. Lawrence—"Lectures in 'Medical Gazette' and Communica- tion from"	1, 23
Dr. Beatty—"Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine".....	1, 20
Dr. Churchill—"Diseases of Women—Answers to Queries and Evi- dence before Commissions"	1, 12, 35, 40
Dr. Beck—"Elements of Medical Jurisprudence".....	1, 23
Dr. Percival—"Medical Ethics"	22
Mr. Kinder Wood—"Medico-Chirurgical Transactions".....	1, 30
Dr. Thompson—"Lectures in Lancet"	2, 31
Dr. Duverges—"Medecine Legale"	2
Dr. Taylor—"Medical Jurisprudence"	2, 32
Dr. Duchesne—"Prostitution in Algiers"	3
Dr. Montgomery—Communication from	2
Mr. Hamilton—"Medical Press"	4
Dr. Geoghegan—"Answers to Queries and Examination at Com- mission"	12, 34, 40
Mr. Cusack—"Answers to Queries and Examination at Commis- sion"	12, 27, 34, 39
Dr. Hatchell—"Answers to Queries"	12, 37
Mr. Hughes—Communication from.....	19
Mr. Dwyer—Communication from	19
Dr. M'Clintock—Communication from	19
Mr. Kesteven—in "Medical Gazette"	24
Mr. Moss—in the "Lancet"	27
Dr. Armstrong—"On Diseases of Children"	30
Dr. Underwood—"On Diseases of Children"	30
Dr. Ryan—"Manual of Medical Jurisprudence"	31
Dr. Ireland—Examination at Police Office—Sworn Informations— Letters in "Freeman's Journal"—Evidence at Commission	1, 10, 12, 38
Dr. Speedy—Communication from	7
Dr. Capuron	31, 32
Dr. Darwall.....	31
Baron Dupuytren—"Medico-Chirurgical Review"	31
Dr. Foderé	31
Dr. Davis—"Obstetric Medicine"	31
Dr. Cormack—"Edinburgh Monthly Journal"	x
Dr. Hynes—Communication from	32

HISTORY OF THE RECENT EPIDEMIC OF INFANTILE LEUCORRHŒA IN DUBLIN.

CONSIDERABLE excitement has prevailed among all classes in Dublin during the last month (August 1853), owing to the circumstance of no less than three cases of felonious assaults upon children under ten years of age having been brought forward by the Crown at the Commission before the Chief Justices. Since these trials, leading articles have appeared in some newspapers on the subject; and a correspondence has been published in the *Freeman's Journal*, between Dr. Ireland, the Physician to the Police, upon whose informations the cases were sent for trial, and myself, as I had one of the accused persons defended. I think it also right to mention, that so impressed were those members of the Profession in Dublin who were acquainted with the circumstances of the cases, that Professors Cusack, Beatty, and Geoghegan, and Drs. Churchill, Hughes, Hatchell, and Speedy, all came forward in court gratuitously, to tender their evidence in what they considered the cause of truth, science, and humanity.

Most practical physicians or surgeons, particularly those attached to public institutions, or who are well acquainted with the diseases of the lower classes, know perfectly well that vaginal discharges, attended with inflammation of the external parts, and an exematous excoriation of the labiæ, and the adjacent portions of the thighs, are not uncommon affections in girls aged from four or five to ten years. This disease has been lately denominated infantile leucorrhœa, but vaginitis is a more characteristic term. It is of a more decidedly inflammatory character than leucorrhœa, and the accompanying discharge is puriform. Occasionally, it assumes a very virulent appearance, resembling cancrum oris; and sloughing of the genitals, and even death has followed. It is at times epidemic. Sir Astley Cooper published, in his Lectures on Surgery, nearly forty years ago, an accurate description of the disease, and also in graphic terms described the consequences likely to result upon the discovery of such affections. Mr. Lawrence, in one of his lectures on Surgery, published in the *Medical Gazette* for 21st August, 1830, also described the disease. Dr. Beatty, in the article "Rape," in the "Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine;" Dr. Churchill, in his work on "Diseases of Women;" Dr. Beck, in his "Elements of Medical Jurisprudence;" Mr. Ward, in "Percival's Medical Ethics;" Mr. Kinder Wood, in the "Medico Chirurgical Transactions," vol. vii.;

Professor Thomson, in his lectures published in the *Lancet* for December 4, 1846; Duverges, in his *Medicin Legale*; and, to come down to the latest authority, Dr. A. S. Taylor, in the last edition of his work on the same subject, has entered minutely into the legal questions likely to arise in cases of this nature;—so that one is rather astonished at finding that any mistake should now arise as to the nature and causes of such affections.

But as such errors have arisen, and might, but for the pains taken to expose them, have led to the most serious consequences, I think it my duty to bring the matter under the notice of my readers, not merely as a warning to such members of the profession as might, from inexperience, be led into similar errors in future, but as an exposure of the deficient system of medical police in the United Kingdom, and as a warning to lawyers and public prosecutors with respect to medical jurisprudence—a subject, by the way, on which, except when barristers “cram” for the defence of a prisoner, they are especially deficient. Even judges may occasionally require to have the well-established laws of medical jurisprudence very forcibly pressed upon them, before they will receive them in evidence against the *assertion* of an ignorant witness.

The causes of the inflammation and muco-purulent discharge from the genitals of young children may be an impaired state of the general health, arising from ill-feeding a residence in an unhealthy locality,—scrofula, intestinal worms, fever, infection, dirt, and the neglect and inattention of parents and guardians. Generally speaking, the disease arises, in the first instance, from some of the foregoing causes, and is then aggravated by uncleanness. Being at first, and when perhaps confined to the vagina, painless, no complaint is made by the child, until the urine passing over the exco-riated surfaces of the labiæ and inside of the thighs, or, in aggravated cases, the difficulty which the little patient experiences in walking, attracts attention. Frequently, however, accident, or the state of the child's linen, first calls attention to her state.

It is here proper to premise, that a delusion prevails very extensively among the lower orders in Ireland to the effect, that a man can get rid of an obstinate gonorrhœa, which has “failed the doctors,” by having connexion with a virgin;(a) and, as the easiest mode of effecting that object, a child of tender years is selected; and hence the felonious assaults occasionally attempted, and for which men have been most justly convicted, and most righteously punished. But in all such cases it has been proved, that *the men laboured under*

(a) Dr. Montgomery informs me, that he knew a case in which a servant woman affected with gonorrhœa induced a little boy to have connexion with her, in the hope of thus curing herself.

gonorrhœa or *venereal*, although the popular impression among the lower orders is, that the disease is not only completely but *instantaneously* transmitted from the male to the female. But it is not alone in this country that this popular delusion prevails. From the work of Duchesne, on the Prostitution of Algiers, just published, we learn, that "the Arabs believe, that syphilis may be *transmitted* to a negro female, the individual thus transmitting it *becoming free from the disease*." Well aware of this wide-spread superstition, and also naturally suspicious of any disease in the genitals of a female child or young girl, the mother at once jumps to the conclusion that some impure connexion has taken place, and possibly she may be confirmed in this idea by some medical man not conversant with such affections stating that it may be either *gonorrhœa* or the result of violence. But even without this medical authority, the mother commences a course of questioning and threatening, so precisely identical with that so graphically described by Cooper, that one would think she had been instructed out of his lectures; in fact, the evidence given upon the cases lately tried in Dublin was, in truth, but a paraphrase of the very words of our great surgeon. First commences the questioning as to the fact of connexion. This the poor child denies, and generally holds thereto for a greater or less period, varying according to her own knowledge of or her appreciation of truth, or the amount of reward offered, or of punishment threatened. Now, upon this subject I may remark, that where a child, who has neither love nor passion to influence her, has had connexion with a man, it is not likely that she will conceal it from her mother or near relatives when hard pressed; but in all cases where the crime has not been committed, considerable time elapses before the story is made out. In one of the cases tried in Dublin, the mother stated in her informations, that she had to threaten her daughter severely for more than a day and night before she would confess to the fact; and she also swore at the Commission, that she threatened her little girl "*to cut her tongue out of her*." And in another case, the mother,—a step-mother by the way—commenced her inquiries by giving the unhappy child a sound flogging, and a threatening of more if she would not confess.

Then comes the next part of this extraordinary drama, also graphically described by Cooper. The names of a number of persons are suggested, not in the first instance as having perpetrated the crime, but merely as having been kind to the child, paid it attention, or given it presents. The child acknowledges to some such act of kindness. In one of the Dublin instances, a bit of sugar, given some months before by the prisoner to the child, was

the alleged reward, and also the reason why that particular person was selected; and in one of the other instances, "a penny to buy strawberries," was said to be the reward. The name having been at length selected, the threatenings are recommenced, and a series of questionings, as to whether such and such circumstances did not take place are instituted; and thus, as Sir Astley said, with great truth, "The child is driven to confess what never happened in order to save herself from being chastised." All this time the infatuated mother, firmly believing in the commission of a foul act, little suspects that in the promptings and suggestions to her frightened innocent child, she is leading it from the path of truth and demoralizing its mind by entering into details which, as may easily be seen from the language afterwards adopted by the child at her examinations, are those of a grown person well acquainted with such matters, and of the mother who, as the great authority so often quoted said, being "perhaps not quite clear herself she is more ready to suspect others." If the child is taken to an hospital or a public institution (as occurred in three of the nine cases which lately appeared in Dublin) the mother may be disabused of her unjust suspicions, and the nature of her child's disease explained to her;—and she may return to her home happy and contented, while at the same time her child is prescribed for and soon gets well. But if, on the other hand, she applies to the police, the accused person is immediately arrested without summons or warrant, as the crime is a felony punishable by transportation for life. And a system of examination and enquiry is pursued which may lead to a public trial, in which the accused man, unless ably defended or assisted by medical evidence in his behalf, stands a good chance of being sent to Spike Island or a penal colony. Such was nearly being the catastrophe lately, the particulars of which are as follow:—

I have already stated, that the disease is occasionally epidemic, and such would appear to have been recently the case in Dublin, as I have received the particulars of no less than nine cases, viz., one recorded by Mr. Hamilton in the *Dublin Medical Press*, for the 4th of May last, and tried before the Recorder; the three which formed the subjects of the late trials at the Commission; two which presented at the Pitt-street Dispensary, under the care of Drs. Croker and Hardy; two treated by Dr. M'Clintock; and one at present under the care of Mr. Dwyer. In none of the cases where the children were first brought to public Institutions, or where private practitioners were consulted, were trials instituted, although, in three of them, the mothers were at first possessed with the same suspicions regarding violence and infection to which I have already alluded. In the case related by Mr. Hamilton, the first of the epidemic which

presented, the facts are these:—A beggar child, residing in a dirty, unhealthy lane, leading from one of the principal markets, was in the habit of receiving bread and other charities from P. Tracy, the butler of a solicitor residing on the north side of the city. Upon a certain day, the master of the house, when going out to dine, observed her at his hall door, waiting to receive the usual charity given to her at such times. He desired her to go away from the place. Trivial as this circumstance is, it is worthy of note, inasmuch as it would be one of those facts laid hold of by the Crown as corroborative of the child's statement regarding time and place. Some time afterwards, the mother having discovered a vaginal discharge and excoriation, etc., in her child, put her through the usual course of examination, and then brought her to the police-office, where she charged the servant of the gentleman alluded to with having violated her upon the day when she was seen at the door by the master; and she swore that the crime took place in the gentleman's office, next room to the dining parlour in which his family were then sitting either at or after dinner! The case came, in due course, before the magistrates; the medical officer of the police made the usual examination of both parties; found the man perfectly free from disease, but stated, that the child laboured under a vaginal discharge, with other marks, which, together with the child's evidence, induced the magistrate to send the case for trial, and to refuse a large amount of bail offered for the prisoner. The informations of the child are very concise, merely stating how, when, and where the act occurred. Neither the mother, nor the medical officer of the police swore any informations, and as the gentleman's family were naturally exceedingly distressed at the circumstance, the case was kept as private as possible, and no account of it appeared in the public newspapers. The child, says Mr. Hamilton, in his report, was sent to the Richmond Hospital, "by the police, as having been violated; the man suspected of the offence was in custody. The face was pale, but not delicate-looking; the crime was said to have been committed a fortnight before. Her story, which she *detailed very glibly*," being that already related. The disease in the genitals was characterised by the usual symptoms of swelling, redness, superficial sores, vaginal discharge, eczematous excoriations, extending over so much of the thighs as were washed by the discharge, or came in contact with each other. A few of the neighbouring lymphatics were enlarged. To assist in forming a diagnosis of the case, Mr. Hamilton performed inoculation, with the matter of the sores, on the thighs of the patient; but it failed. The child, he says, was in a "filthy state," at the time of her admission. The accused person did not exhibit "the smallest trace" of any affection of the genitals. I expressed an opinion, therefore,

says Mr. Hamilton, "that as far as the medical evidence went, there was nothing to show that any violence had been used with the child, or that contact had communicated the venereal disease." The Medical Officer of the police acknowledged at the investigation, that the appearances might be from dirt, though they might be from violence; the case was, therefore, sent for trial before the Recorder; but, at the Sessions, "the child completely broke down in her evidence, and the innocence of the accused was fully proved." In this case, it must be remembered, that the girl who so glibly detailed the whole circumstance of the connexion, was in hospital for a fortnight, away from the tutoring of her parent, between the date of the arrest and the day of trial. She was taken from the hospital to the Court. The master of the servant, to his credit be it told, believing fully in his innocence, had him defended at the trial, but although acquitted, he could not take him back into his service, owing to the prejudice which existed against his character.

I have not heard of any other case, until about the beginning of July, when it would appear, that with the close weather which was felt in Dublin at that time, several cases occurred in the dirty lanes, and close unhealthy localities of our ill-sewered city. In point of time, the first of these cases was that of Margaret Walsh, a child, aged nine and a-half years, in whom the disease presented in a very virulent form when it was discovered by her step-mother, who, however, acknowledged that she had remarked her *walking lame for several weeks before*. There was considerable swelling and inflammation of the parts, and a most profuse purulent discharge. Upon the discovery of the disease by the step-mother, she at once accused the child of impropriety, and demanded the name of the person who had diseased her. Upon the child's denying all knowledge of such, she was forthwith "soundly flogged," and repetitions of the punishment promised until she confessed. It came out at the investigation, that the mother took down the cross from the mantle-piece, and threatened her therewith,—a very impressive mode of adjuration among the lower order of Irish. The neighbouring women interfered, and by threats and promises endeavoured to extort an acknowledgment, but without effect. Names of different persons were then suggested, but still the child said she could not remember any of them having offended her. Finally, an elder sister who was present during one of these scenes of torture, reminded the child of an old pensioner named Barber, who resided in a distant part of the city, but who was formerly a neighbour of hers, having given her a bit of sugar some months before, when they lived in his neighbourhood. This she acknowledged, and then arose the accusation. The mother and child rushed to the police-office; the accused

was immediately arrested, carried before the magistrate, and, upon the evidence of the child and the police doctor, committed for trial and sent to prison. In her information, sworn upon the 30th July, the child stated that the prisoner, who lives at a distant part of the city, took her into the open hall of an adjoining house; and she then entered into a most minute detail of the whole circumstances of the transaction, too disgusting to be quoted here. She also swore to having had intercourse with the prisoner several times during the previous eighteen months. The hall where the crime was alleged to be committed is one of the most public places which could be found. My object in entering into these minutiae is to show, that, even irrespective of medical testimony, the police magistrate should have been more cautious than he was. The medical officer of the police examined both parties; found the man free from disease of any description, but stated his belief to the mother and the magistrate, that the child had got a disease the result of infection. Nevertheless, although the man was so far clear, he was sent for trial. All the foregoing circumstances came out at the trial, where accurate notes were taken of the evidence. After the police examination, the mother took the child to the neighbouring dispensary, where Dr. Speedy, upon seeing the case and recognising its true character, immediately said: "Now, I suppose you are going to accuse some person of having injured your child,"—an impeachment to which she pleaded guilty. He most generously investigated all the circumstances of the case, and came forward at the trial before the Chief Justices; but he was not examined, for two reasons. The case for the Crown broke down in several respects, and the Medical Officer of the police said that he could not then, after the medical evidence which had been given upon a former trial that day, undertake to swear that the child was not infected with the infantile leucorrhœa which was common among children of the lower orders. The prisoner's counsel, however, in a very adroit address to evidence, put it to the Jury, that the child had gonorrhœa which she had received from some other person, as the prisoner was not in any way diseased; and, after a few words from Chief Justice Monahan, the Jury at once acquitted the prisoner, who was discharged, with, however that suspicion against his character which, among persons of his own class, is not easily eradicated,—with the laurels which he won by long service in his country's cause rather tarnished by the time he spent in Newgate, and his next quarter's pension somewhat lightened by the three or four pounds which he had to pay for his defence—while the unhappy child was stigmatised as a young prostitute who had acquired gonorrhœa when little more than nine years of age! Notwithstanding all the discrepancies in the foregoing recital

of Barber's case, he might still have stood a good chance of transportation, but that a strong impression had been made upon the Court and the jury by another trial which came on almost immediately before, although the date of the offence was subsequent to that just mentioned.

A Mrs. Cosgrave, an intelligent and respectable woman in her rank in life, though, as it appeared in Court, not of the most cleanly habits as regards the care of her children, was informed by one of her daughters, upon the morning of the 20th July, that her sister, a little girl, aged about 9½ years, "was very sore," etc. Upon examination, the mother found her linen greatly soiled (it was subsequently sworn at the trial that the child had not had a clean chemise for eleven days, nor been washed for many months), the genitals were red, swollen, and discharging purulent matter, and all the external parts, thighs, and anus excoriated, and covered with an eczematous eruption. She awoke the child, asked her the *cause* of her disease, and questioned her as to how it had occurred, or *who* had been meddling with her. The child answered almost in the very words given by Cooper, "No one, mother; nobody has, I declare to you." Threats of the most severe punishment were then resorted to, as the mother swore in her informations, and as she afterwards detailed at the Commission, such as "cutting her, and bringing her to the doctor," and that "the doctor would *cut the tongue out of her head* if she did not tell what had occurred to her." At the end of the second day the mother suggested to her (as the child acknowledged upon her cross-examination) the name of Patrick Kane, a coachman, residing with his wife and family in the same lane, and who being very fond of children, was in the habit of allowing this little girl, along with his own children, and other boys and girls, to get upon his master's car or carriage while driving round to the stables. Here was the third case made out.

The fourth was that of a little girl aged 7, named Delmere, who resided in the same lane, (which, owing to the neglect of the police and the corporation authorities, is a very unhealthy locality), and in the same house with the prisoner. She, becoming severely affected with vaginal discharge, told her mother, that she was sore; who, upon examination, very properly said, as she swore in her informations, "You are scalded," but asked no questions, and paid no further attention to the matter. Next day, the elder child Cosgrave, who had, by this time made up her mind to the accusation, with all its details and circumstances, meeting her little neighbour in play, and knowing that she also was sore, told her all that had happened to her, and what she had told *her* mother about Mr. Kane. Immediately afterwards, the mother of the elder child sent for the mother of the younger, and told her that, "Kane had committed violence upon both

the children." During the night, the exasperated and infatuated mothers went to the police, and had the man taken out of his bed; the accusation being for a felony, and not requiring either warrant or summons.

At the Police-office next morning, Saturday, July 23rd, each child swore to *precisely the self-same story*; that the prisoner at 1 o'clock on the Friday week before (which she said she had reason for remembering), had taken her up to a hay-loft by a certain ladder, committed the act, made use of certain expressions, and then brought her down again. With respect to the commission of the crime, the examining magistrate led each child into the most minute details by asking the following—"Did the prisoner lay you down?" "Did he take *down* his breeches?" "Did he take up your petticoats?" "Did he lie down upon you?" "Did he put his private parts into yours?" To each question of which the child answered "Yes, Sir!" she being then upon her oath. (a) But, she herself gave no history whatsoever of the transaction further than her answers to the magistrate, and never said, "No!" to any question put to her. In fact, I believe, she would have said "Yes" to the most preposterous question put to her by the magistrate. This may possibly be the usual form of examination, but it is one which, I think, in the case of young children, and especially when labouring under fear of punishment, and where there may be a doubt of their veracity, is very objectionable, being, I think, liable to the imputation of "a suggestion." In proof of this, it is remarkable that the exact expressions employed by the magistrate, with respect to the mode of committal of the act were those used by the child at the subsequent examination before the commission, when, although more than three weeks had elapsed, she was able to detail the circumstance minutely. Furthermore, the term "private parts" used by grown persons, and employed by the magistrate and the law officers of the Crown, is certainly not the expression likely to flow spontaneously, or without tuition, from the lips of young children in the rank of life of the prosecutrices. (b)

Before I proceed further into the details of these two cases, it is right to inform the reader, that the accused person was my coachman, and hence the reason why I have thus

(a) Persons who may be acquainted with the ignorance or simplicity of young children will be rather surprised at hearing them, when handed the book in a Court of Justice, and asked if they know the nature of an oath, without a minute's hesitation reply, "If I told a lie I'd go to hell."

(b) In a case of felonious assault tried lately before Judge Ball, at the assizes at Maryborough, the child, on her cross-examination by Mr. Curran, acknowledged, that she had been told by a policeman's wife, in the barrack where she had lately resided, how to describe the act which she said had been committed upon her. It was a case somewhat similar to those which recently occurred in Dublin; the child having had a discharge, and the prisoner being unaffected. The case broke down completely, and the man was acquitted.

anxiously investigated the whole matter, not merely for the purpose of defending him, but of showing, that the crimes were never committed; and thus wiping out the foul national stain of having it alleged, that *four* children were violated in our city within the space of two or three months. A man may bear a previously good moral character, yet, we know, be guilty of the most heinous offence; I have, therefore, only to say for this person, that he had lived with myself and others many years, and bore a most unblemished character. He and his wife and family lived in the lane running at the rear of the street in which I reside; and, being remarkably fond of children, he was in the habit, as I already mentioned, of allowing those residing in the lane to get upon the car or carriage "for a drive," when passing in or out to the stables, which he usually does *at stated hours*, and also of permitting them to go into the yard, and to occasionally get on the hay-loft (to look at some kittens, *as the child acknowledged* on her cross-examination). I allude to these circumstances here, because, as in the former case, they afforded materials for the Crown to get up *corroborative evidence*.

I now come to the medical portion of the testimony, as well as to the details of the part which I myself, and so many of the Profession here, took in the subsequent history of these two cases. Having heard, early in the morning, of the man's arrest, and the crime of which he was accused, I wrote to Mr. Fitzgerald, the eminent solicitor, to request his attendance, and, proceeding to the police-office with a county magistrate who happened to breakfast with me, I learned the particulars of the charge, and that Dr. Ireland, the medical officer of the police, and the authority always consulted in such instances, was sent for to examine the children, and had appointed twelve o'clock for that purpose. I then made an application to Mr. Bourke, the presiding magistrate, to be present at that examination, a request to which he at once politely acceded, at the same time remarking, that he believed prisoners had a right to the benefit of a medical man upon such occasions. I next proceeded to that portion of the office where the children were in charge, and delivered the magistrate's order to the Superintendent of Police, who, through the medium of a Sergeant Fitzpatrick, subsequently delivered it to the medical officer. I did not hold any communication with the prisoner, nor see him, until he was brought to the bar during the subsequent investigation; but I returned at the appointed time, and remained with the magistrate until the medical officer had arrived, about an hour afterwards. He informed me, that he had received the message, but could not think of letting me be present, as he "was a public officer, and had a public duty to perform;" but that I might

make my mind easy, as both the children had a most profuse purulent discharge from the genitals, that the man was perfectly free from any disease whatever, and that he was "under the impression that the magistrate would adjudicate summarily upon the case;" with all of which I acquainted the prisoner's solicitor. The medical officer, in his examination before the magistrate, said, he could not say whether the disease was gonorrhœa or not, but he subsequently swore, that although purulent discharges, redness, swellings, and excoriations, such as those children presented, might be occasionally the result of dirt or "riding upon a stick;" and, notwithstanding that there was "no laceration whatever," and "no appearance of an attempt at penetration," yet that such appearances might also be "*the result of violence*;" upon which the magistrate at once said, that he would take the informations, send the cases for trial, and commit the man to prison, whom the medical examiner also swore to be perfectly free from gonorrhœa or any venereal disease; nor did he even appear, after the most careful examination, to have ever had any affection of that nature. (a) The prisoner was then removed. Shocked and distressed at the result of the investigation, I then left the office without offering bail for the prisoner, who was sent to prison. On conferring with the solicitor, he told me, that, from all he could then learn, he did not believe the man to be guilty; but that, at all events, the circumstance of both children swearing to the commission of the act upon the self-same day and hour, without either having seen the other, would acquit him. The solicitor took notes of the examination; so also did the police clerk, in order to save trouble in subsequently drawing up the children's informations. Fortunately for the cause of truth and science, the medical officer, contrary to his usual habit, swore an information in both cases, of which the following is an extract:—"There is a discharge of purulent matter, which may have been caused by some violence applied, or might have arisen from want of cleanliness, or from riding on a stick. There has not been any penetration of the vagina. Could not say whether the discharge is gonorrhœa or not. That there is some excoriation which is confined to the exterior parts of the private parts, but no laceration." The testimony was almost in the same words in both cases.

(a) I do not know what the usual form of examination of a man accused of this crime may be in England; but I believe the rule is, in all cases, to desire a prisoner "not to say anything which might criminate himself, or might afterwards be used against him." Upon the prisoner Kane being brought before the medical officer of the police, and after the inspection was instituted, he was asked by the physician, "When did you get this little running?" to which the man indignantly replied, "I beg your pardon, Sir; I have not had any running."

Much dissatisfied with the police investigation, and believing that the whole was a trumped-up story, especially as I was excluded from the medical examination, I immediately after called on Dr. Geoghegan, Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, and requested him to see the children; and I also waited on Dr. Ireland, as a matter of professional etiquette, and told him of my desire to see the children, along with Dr. Geoghegan and himself; and subsequently an appointment to that effect was made for three o'clock next day. As soon as I saw the children, and recognised the disease under which they laboured, I at once saw the mistake that had been committed; and, subsequently confirmed in my opinion by Dr. Geoghegan, I determined to offer bail for the accused, (which was required to a large amount,) and to defend him to the utmost of my power. The child Cosgrave appeared to be much out of health, and had recently lost a portion of the nail of one of her fingers from whitlow, which, she said, had caused her "great pain." This trivial fact is of great importance, as will appear in the sequel.

My next step was to request of Mr. Cusack, Dr. Churchill, and Dr. Hatchell, to examine the children. I chose these three persons on account of their peculiar positions in the Profession—a Professor of Surgery to the University; a lecturer and distinguished writer upon the diseases of children; and the Medical Officer to the Constabulary (not the Metropolitan police). I procured copies of the informations from the magistrates; from the same source I obtained the services of a police constable to conduct the medical men to the residences of the children, and having given bail for the prisoner, I took him out of prison. Placing the five informations which were sworn, in the hands of these gentlemen, and committing them to the guidance of the police-officer appointed by the magistrate, I sent them to examine the children; and I also submitted for their inspection the accused, about three o'clock upon the Monday after the Saturday upon which the case was investigated at the police office. In the course of the evening, I addressed a series of questions, twelve in number, to each of the four medical men who had examined the children and the accused, with respect to the diseased state under which they found the children—as to whether such could have been the result of violence or mechanical irritation—whether the assault could have been committed at the time specified, without producing so much pain and soreness as not to attract the attention of friends—whether the vaginal discharge and excoriation which these children presented, could have arisen from attempts at violation, etc.; and also as to the state of the accused, etc. It is unnecessary here to go into the minutiae of these questions, or the answers returned, which, together with two short-hand writers' notes of the trial, will be

published hereafter. Suffice it to say, that the answers of these four eminent authorities completely exonerated the accused, and showed, as far as medical evidence could show, that the crime had never been committed, and that the whole was a misconception arising out of the popular delusion so graphically detailed by Cooper nearly forty years ago, and which I have given at length in the introduction.

A few days after, I waited upon the Attorney-General, with a written statement of what I conceived to be the facts of the case—describing the popular delusion, giving a verbatim copy of the medical men's opinions; referring him to the various medical and medico-legal opinions upon the subject; and finally giving him the minute and circumstantial details of an *alibi*, showing that the accused was not at the place specified, for four hours before nor three hours after the date assigned for the commission of the crime. He told me he had ordered the case for trial, possessed the most "corroborative proofs" of the children's statements, and could not possibly receive anything offered in the prisoners' defence. I endeavoured to argue the case, and show him that the crime had not been committed, and that the whole was a popular prejudice founded in ignorance and superstition, and put to him several cases in which it would, I thought, be his duty, as a public prosecutor, to quash the proceedings; but these he said he could not in the present instance possibly entertain: and added that it would not look well to give up the trial of "a doctor's servant" because other medical men came forward in his behalf. I, therefore, took my leave, assuring my friend, the Attorney-General, that I would certainly defeat him at the prosecution; as, being fully assured not only of the man's innocence but of the non-committal of the crime, I was determined to defend the prisoner to the utmost of my power.

The Grand Jury found bills of indictment in both cases, and a day was fixed for the trial.

Three very eminent lawyers, whom I waited upon, refused to undertake the case; "it was a nasty one; and crimes of that nature were not easily defended, etc."

Powerful advocates, well acquainted with such cases, were, however, obtained. A day was fixed for the three trials, one of which, that of Barber, has been already detailed; and Professors Cusack, Beatty, and Geoghegan, and Drs. Churchill, Hatchell, and Hughes, generously came forward, at considerable inconvenience, to bear testimony upon the subject at issue. The prisoner was given in charge for the full crime of rape, viz., that of carnally knowing and abusing a child under ten years of age; and it was evident, from the array of Queen's Counsel, that the Crown were bent upon attaining a conviction, in order, if possible, to put down that offence, which, from the number

of cases which presented, appeared to be epidemic in the city, and in which they had already been foiled in the instance of Tracy. The Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench (Lefroy), and the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas (Monahan), presided. I procured the attendance of two special reporters from the newspaper offices, whose notes of the trial will appear in due course.

The Honourable Mr. Plunkett stated the case with great moderation, remarking upon the previous exceedingly good character of the man, and saying most justly, that the principal question which would arise was entirely a medical one, being as to the nature and cause of the appearances which the child Cosgrave, the first case called on, presented. The prosecutrix, $9\frac{1}{2}$ years old,—who was an admirable witness, went through the recital already mentioned, and entered very minutely into her reasons for knowing the precise hour, such as looking at the clock upon her return home, and, in order to make sure, asking her mother what o'clock it was, etc.,—stated, that she walked over to her sister's, at a distant part of the city, shortly after the crime was committed; that the difficulty of making water, soreness, and discharge commenced the day after the committal of the offence;—denied that she hesitated for a moment telling her mother about the cause, but acknowledged, that it was her mother first asked her about the prisoner Kane. The mother and an elder daughter were examined; they, however, contradicted themselves and the child in many particulars, but were quite agreed in fixing the same day and hour as that stated by the child, and gave special reasons for their remembering them. The mother said the child came home to her "crying" at the time when the offence is alleged to have been committed; but acknowledged, that she asked her, was it her finger (then affected with severe whitlow, and from which she lost her nail) which was paining her, and she said it was. This crying was one of the "corroborative proofs" relied on by the Crown. Dr. Ireland, the Medical officer of the police, described the state of disease the children were in, and said, "I do not think a man's private parts could enter the vagina of this child; but the penis might go between the labia, which were the parts diseased. I cannot say what the nature of the disease was. It might have been produced by external irritation. The irritation produced by a man's penis might, I think, produce it." And again to the Court: "I am of opinion, that the discharge may have been produced by friction with the penis of a healthy man." This seemed to be, at that period of the case, the turning point of the evidence for the Crown. Mr. Curran then commenced to read the opinion of Sir Astley Cooper, to which I have already referred, but was stopped by the Lord Chief

Justice, who said, that "it was not law nor evidence, but only a Medical man's opinion." The witness, however, upon being referred to the extract, said, "I perfectly concur in everything stated by Sir Astley Cooper; but, in the present case, I have formed my opinion without reference to the views of any other surgeon." Professor Harrison was in court to watch the proceedings. He had been sent by the Crown to examine the children; but, having done so, he reported to the authorities, that he could find nothing to warrant the conclusion, that any violence had been attempted. Had the case for the Crown not broken down, he would have been examined on behalf of the prisoner.

It is unnecessary here to describe the speeches of counsel, which were in their way admirable, and well calculated "to get off" a prisoner. I had, however, in common with my professional brethren who were present, a much higher object in view,—that of explaining to the Court, and the public, the delusion under which the whole case was got up, and of showing that the crime had not been committed. It was manifest, however, throughout, that the Court was rather against the prisoner, and that the Crown counsel earnestly sought a conviction.

The first witness examined for the defence was Mr. Cusack—that portion of his testimony which particularly bears upon the case is as follows:—"I examined the two children (Cosgrave, the prosecutrix, and Delmere); both were affected with the same complaint. They were filthy, and had a discharge from the pudendum. There was a crust surrounding the parts upon the true skin, which arose from the deposits from the discharge. This child had not the slightest mark of violence; and it was simply a case of a disease which all medical men have met with, and which is very common among children who are strumous, or badly cared, or who have been in contact with each other. It is usually found in low life, but sometimes it is found in the better walks of life, where children have suffered from other complaints tending to weaken the constitution; and, I confess, I was horror-struck at the time to hear that the prisoner at the bar was accused of such a crime. *I am as convinced as I am of my existence that there was no violence offered or attempted upon this child, and that this is a common disease, which is universally known to the profession.* I conversed with Sir Astley Cooper on this very subject, and I entirely concur with what appears in his lectures, that numbers have suffered unjustly from such charges as the present, being fabricated by the mothers of children." This evidence, which was given in a very decided and energetic manner, seemed to produce a considerable sensation in Court; on which the Lord Chief Justice and the Crown Counsel cross-examined the witness to a considerable extent, in order to show, that

although there were no marks of violence, "a penetration between the labia, accompanied with force, but not sufficient to do any injury to the surface," might have occurred. In answer to this mode of putting the question, the witness said—"If the penis was brought into contact with the parts, and a discharge ensued in consequence, it would certainly be a species of violence; but, in the present case, there was nothing to show me that any friction had taken place externally, or that any attempt had been made to do anything wrong. *I am confident that the discharge was not, in any respect, the consequence of friction from the penis of any man.* If there is violence, it would cause pain, but I could find not a trace of violence upon this child." One would have thought that this evidence might have induced the Crown to give up the case; but the lawyers only took it up the more determinedly, and, seeing that disease from natural causes was established, changed their hand, endeavoured to prove, by the subsequent witnesses, that, acknowledging the child was in the diseased state described at the time the crime was committed, still that penetration between the labia, without what might be styled violence, but as a simple application of the parts, might have taken place,—as the Chief Justice described it, the introduction of the parts without force, and even to the "hundredth part of an inch."

Professor Geoghegan swore with regard to the state of uncleanness in which he found the child, and said, she had "a chronic disease of, I should say, several weeks' standing. In my opinion it was not possible that the disease could be of one week's standing, and I am further of opinion that the disease could not have resulted from violence of any undiseased man. Had the assemblage of appearances I witnessed resulted from violence on the part of an undiseased man, there would have been other signs of violence present, which were not visible in this case. If violence had been committed upon this child by a man lying on her upon the hay, so as to hurt her in that way, I think she would not be able to walk over to Ship-street in the evening, and home again the next morning." The Crown pressed this witness also upon the subject of the friction alluded to by Dr. Ireland. His answer was:—"In my opinion, violent friction by a man against the private parts of the child could not have possibly produced the disease I saw, because—first, it was of long standing—and second, if there had been sufficient violence to produce such a copious discharge, it would have produced other signs that were not present in this instance." Mr. Corballis, Q.C. then put the following question, which evidently threw overboard all the previous medical testimony, and is one upon which the most serious consequences may hereafter hinge. "Is it possible that, supposing the child to have had this disease at the time of the alleged

offence, a man might, on the 15th of July, have introduced the extremity of the penis between the labia and no further?" Dr. Geoghegan said, "It is; but if such an attempt were made, considering the great disparity of the parts of the man and child, I think it could not be done without a certain degree of laceration."

Dr. Churchill was next examined, who gave similar testimony to the foregoing with respect to there not being the slightest evidence of violence, and that the disease was ordinary infantile leucorrhœa. He was cross-examined at considerable length, in order to elicit an admission of the point on which the Crown then relied—That "slight penetration without giving pain" might, notwithstanding the state in which the children were, have taken place. His answer was:—"I think penetration in a child so young and where the organs are so disproportionate, would give pain." Each of these three medical men also deposed as to the healthy state of the prisoner, whom they had minutely examined.

The counsel for the defence now said, they saw clearly that, notwithstanding the high medical evidence which was brought forward, that the Crown were determined upon a conviction, that the Court were with them, and that, if the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, the man would certainly be transported; that there was no use in offering more medical testimony, and that nothing but the *alibi*, to which I have already alluded, could possibly save him. It was therefore thought advisable not to produce any more medical witnesses, but to have recourse to the *alibi*, which was not brought forward in the first instance for two reasons,—first, because it would be necessary to produce in Court a lady whom the prisoner was driving through the town at the time of the alleged offence, and for more than two hours afterwards; and, secondly, because I myself, and a large body of the Profession here, were most anxious to have a full medical inquiry into the case, in order to show what the disease really was which had been mistaken by the infatuated mothers for the result of violence; and also to show that no crime had been committed. Fortunately, the Court retired for a short space, and time was thus allowed for sending for the lady who was the principal witness for the *alibi*. Regarding this portion of the defence, it will be enough to say, that it was satisfactorily proved that from half-past nine in the morning until half-past three in the afternoon of the day upon which the crime was said to have been committed (between twelve and one o'clock) the prisoner was engaged driving, and never returned to his stables. The Crown, thus foiled, endeavoured to break down the *alibi* by a lengthened cross-examination, but ineffectually, as, by a very remarkable concatenation of circumstances, the usual time for

the man's return to the stables was interrupted upon this particular day, and he was, upon the whole, nearly seven hours without returning to the stables. A child might possibly mistake or forget the day, but the mother and sister had fixed the precise date with such certainty as to leave no loophole for escape upon this point.

Upon seeing the turn the *alibi* took, the Lord Chief Justice rather testily said to Mr. Rolleston, one of the prisoner's counsel, "Why didn't you give us the *alibi* first, instead of treating us to a medical dissertation?" He very properly answered, that he did not like to produce a lady in Court, and that he thought the medical evidence would have been quite sufficient. The Court then appealed to the Crown Counsel as to whether they could possibly go on with the case after the *alibi*. The case was then given up, and an issue having been handed to the jury in both cases, that of Cosgrave just related, and also the child Delmere, the jury, by direction of His Lordship, acquitted the prisoner.

Now, with regard to the case of the child Delmere, to which I have already alluded at page 8, and who swore before the magistrate to the committal of the crime upon the 15th July, at one o'clock, the self same day and hour on which the child Cosgrave said she had been violated,—upon procuring copies of the informations two days after they were sworn, I was much astonished to find that the date of the offence in this case was three days different from that sworn to in the first instance, in the *viva voce* testimony. I immediately applied to the magistrate for an explanation of the circumstance. He informed me, that he had himself observed the peculiarity of the different date being in the informations which were read over to the child when she came to swear them (after the prisoner had been removed, and his solicitor and myself had left the office,) to that which she swore to originally; but that he passed no remark thereon. The clerk who took down the evidence, said he had destroyed his notes. Both the magistrate and clerk were subpoenaed to the Commission, and would have been examined as to the circumstance, had not the Crown given up this case. Both children being tutored, as I believe, into the recital of the same story, they naturally stated, that the crime occurred upon the self-same day and hour, a circumstance which must have attracted the attention of the person who subsequently prepared the informations at the police-office, and who must evidently have seen that such an incongruity would have tended to the acquittal of the prisoner.

It is unnecessary to enter into the details of the five other cases of vaginal discharge in young children, to which I have already alluded. In the cases at the Pitt-street Dispensary, the symptoms were somewhat similar to those which formed the subject of the late trials, but the mothers being of

a decenter class, and keeping their children cleaner, the extent of disease was not so great. The ages of the children were four and seven years. In that aged four, the mother entertained the same cruel suspicions, until assured by Dr. Croker of the nature of the affection. In the former case the disease was discovered on the 28th June, and in the latter the 15th of July, the date assigned to the two last cases of violation. The last case which I have heard of occurred about ten days ago. An intelligent woman, residing in a garret in Golden-lane—one of the most unhealthy localities in the city of Dublin—discovered a vaginal discharge in one of her children, a girl, between four and five years of age. Greatly distressed at the circumstance, she informed her husband, who most properly desired her not to mention it to any of her neighbours, but to take the child to a doctor. She brought it to Mr. Dwyer, of Camden-street, and, in great anxiety, stated her fears as to the nature of the discharge her child had got. Upon his offering, however,—to use his own expression—“to take his oath” to her that the disease the child had was nothing wrong, she was perfectly satisfied, and is now most grateful. I saw the child with Mr. Dwyer about a week ago (August 10). It was delicate and puny-looking; there was some swelling and considerable redness of the labia and external parts, from which, as well as from the vagina, there was a considerable yellowish discharge; but, as the child was kept exceedingly clean, there was very little excoriation or eczematous rash. Mr. Dwyer was well acquainted with the affection, not only from the description given by Cooper, but from his having had a similar case about eighteen months ago, the particulars of which he has given me, and in which, upon the discovery of the discharge by the mother, she brought an accusation against a man who lodged in the same house, and upon whose knee she saw the child sitting some time before. In Dr. M’Clintock’s cases, which both occurred in the early part of July, one child was aged three and a-half, and the other four and a-half years.

Mr. Hughes, one of those medical men who appeared on behalf of the prisoner at the Commission, had a case of the nature of the foregoing some time ago. The following is his letter to me upon hearing of the accusation brought against Kane:—

“A woman brought a daughter of hers, a child apparently under seven years of age, to Jervis-street Hospital, stating that she wished to have the girl examined by the surgeon on duty, as she was afraid that the child had been recently abused by a married man, a fellow-lodger of hers. I consequently examined the child, and found her labouring under inflammation of the vagina, accompanied by a profuse muco-purulent discharge. There were, however, no

marks of violence on any part of the person of the child; and, after a most careful examination of the person of the accused, no trace of disease could be detected on him. The case was investigated at Henry-street Police-office, by Mr. O'Callaghan; and, as I looked on it as one of simple vaginal inflammation, which all Metropolitan surgeons not unfrequently meet with among the children of the lower classes of society,—the result, in some cases, of extreme uncleanness; in others, of neglect of the bowels, irritation from the presence of intestinal worms, dental irritation, etc. etc., the magistrate very properly dismissed the case. I find it a very difficult matter to make the mothers of children so affected believe that the little patients have not been violated."

Dr. Beatty, in the article "Rape," in the "Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine," says, that "in the year 1831 a man was arrested in the City of Dublin, on a charge of rape committed on a child, the only evidence of which was the presence of a purulent discharge from the pudendum. Popular opinion, as is usual in such cases, ran high against him, and it was only through the positive opinion of an intelligent surgeon that the case was explained, and the man liberated. A case of a somewhat similar nature lately came under the observation of the writer. A lady and gentleman came to his house one evening, in a state of great alarm and excitement, accompanied by their child, a girl of four years old, whom they stated to be affected with a terrible disorder, communicated to her by some person in their employment. They had previously shown the child to an apothecary, who confirmed their worst apprehensions, and at once declared that the girl had got a clap. On examination, the parts were found in a state resembling that just described, with a free purulent discharge; and it was with no small degree of pleasure that the writer was able to console the parents by assuring them that their child was labouring under no uncommon affection, and that a few days would set all to rights. It has rarely fallen to his lot to witness a more sudden transition from grief to joy than this announcement effected." Such will, I am sure, be the feelings of every humane man,—such I believe to be the bounden duty of every educated and benevolent practitioner who meets such cases,—no matter whether employed by the police, performing the office of a surgeon or physician to a public institution, or consulted in private. Such explanation should be given in mercy towards the infatuated parents, and the threatened, in some cases the tutored child, as well as in justice towards the accused, and also for the credit of the morals and religion, as well as the honour of the country.

The last notable case of this description, which occurred in Dublin, until the date of the present epidemic, was more

upon the type of Cooper's, or in accordance with his description, than any I have read of for some time. A soldier, of the 7th Dragoons, named Fitten, was on guard at Kilmainham Hospital, on Friday, the 15th August, 1851. Two little girls, daughters of a pensioner, named Fitzpatrick, one aged $6\frac{1}{2}$, and the other about a year older, were remarked playing with him during the course of the day. In the evening he was seen sitting with the children upon a bench, and subsequently with the younger child on his lap. Upon the Tuesday following the younger child complained to her elder sister of having a discharge. The mother was in the habit of changing the children's linen twice a-week, on Sundays and Wednesdays. On Wednesday she remarked the young child's linen soiled with a yellowish discharge, which she found proceeded from the genitals. She at once asked the child who had been with her, particularly upon whose lap she had lately sat. Fitten, the soldier, whom both mother and sister had seen her with upon the Friday evening, was named, and the usual course of interrogating (as subsequently appeared on the trial) was gone through. The woman rushed with her child to the nearest medical practitioner; he confirmed her suspicions, by telling her the child had gonorrhœa. The mother and child proceeded at once "from the doctor's shop" to the police office, and made their complaint; the soldier was arrested; four or five informations—which I have examined—were sworn; by the child as to the fact; by the mother, as to the discovery of the child's state; by the sister and two soldiers, as corroborative evidences of the child being seen with Fitten at the time and place specified; and by the medical man, as to his having examined the child, and found her private parts in a state of great inflammation, and with a discharge "very much resembling gonorrhœa." The man was committed to prison. He was examined, and found perfectly free from either gonorrhœa or syphilis. The case was tried before the Chief Baron at the October Commission, 1851. From the amount of corroborative evidence, it was believed there would be a conviction; and, as the man did not bear a very good character in his regiment, there was but little sympathy for him. Mr. Coffey was retained to defend the prisoner. He informs me, that—as I have already mentioned in a previous part of this communication, is a peculiarity in such cases—he at first felt some hesitation in undertaking the defence, especially as, from perusal of the informations, he thought the prisoner guilty. A medical friend, however, drawing his attention to Sir Astley Cooper's description, he at once saw the similitude, and, acting upon the suggestions therein contained, finally succeeded in having the man acquitted. The child swore that the act was committed while she was sitting on

the soldier's lap, with his cloak around her. In the cross-examination of the corroborative evidence of the soldiers, it appeared that the sentry—an armed man!—was walking up and down within a few yards of them the whole time, and must have heard the child cry if any force had been employed. Mr. Coffey also took the precaution of examining the place where the offence was alleged to have been committed, and directed a surveyor's measurement of the ground to be made. The result was curious, showing that the crime, if committed at all, must have occurred within ten feet of the sentry-box, and within view of a guard-house, which was but thirty feet from where the prisoner sat with the child in his lap. The medical man, in his examination, differed from what he swore in his informations, and then stated, that the appearance which he observed, the swelling, discharge, etc., "might be the result of violence." This difference, in his opinion, somewhat like what occurred at the late Commission, weakened his testimony in the minds of the Jury, particularly as he admitted, on cross-examination, that he had treated the child for several days for gonorrhœa. The prisoner's counsel read the statement of Cooper. The surgeon of the regiment bore testimony to the healthy condition of the man, not only at the time of his arrest, but immediately before the date of the offence, as, being a soldier, he had inspected him weekly. He also bore testimony to the nature of the disease with which children are sometimes affected, and stated that he had met several instances of the kind described by Cooper. The Chief Baron, in charging the Jury, said, it would be a very happy thing for all parties concerned, if the Jury could, after the evidence, come to the opinion that the crime had not been committed, and that the whole was a mistake. The prisoner was acquitted. The case excited much interest, but owing to the nature of the examination, did not appear in the newspaper reports. The foregoing statement, however, which I received from several of the parties concerned, as well as an examination of the informations, may be relied upon. It was made a subject of strong observation to the Jury, by the prisoner's counsel, that had the unfortunate soldier been affected with disease, he undoubtedly would be convicted upon the medical testimony, although the man was undoubtedly innocent.

Sir Astley Cooper says, that he had met thirty such cases in the course of his life, and concludes his observations by saying,—“I am anxious that this complaint should be known by every one present, and that the remarks which I have made should be circulated throughout the kingdom.” In the celebrated case recorded in the early editions of “Percival's Medical Ethics,” and which occurred in Man-

chester, in 1791, the child absolutely died of the disease, and a verdict of murder was returned by the coroner's inquest, against a boy, from the suspicion that violence had been offered. "Not many weeks elapsed, however, before several similar cases occurred, in which there was no reason to suspect that external violence had been offered; and some in which it was absolutely certain that no such injury could have taken place." (a) Now, this is exactly what recently occurred in Dublin. First comes the case of Geoghegan against Tracy, tried before the Recorder, at the beginning of summer. Not many weeks elapsed, however, before eight similar cases occurred, in five of which suspicions and accusations arose, and in three of which the Crown prosecuted at the late commission, although offered satisfactory proofs of the non-committal of the offence, or what perhaps lawyers think of more consequence, proofs of the impossibility of finding the prisoners guilty. Before disposing of the celebrated Manchester case, it is but due to the memory of Mr. Ward, the surgeon who first examined the girl, to say, that before the trial came on, he being convinced that he was under a mistake, most properly came forward and stated so. And, "the Judge informed the Jury, that the evidence adduced was not sufficient to convict; and that it would give rise to much indelicate discussion if they proceeded with the trial." It was accordingly abandoned.

In the *Medico-Chirurgical "Transactions,"* Mr. Kinder Wood has described the disease in its most acute and dangerous form, as ten out of twelve cases proved fatal. In his *Surgical Lectures*, Mr. Lawrence describes the disease under the head of a "*Peculiar Affection of the Genitals in Female Children*,"—(see *Medical Gazette*, for August 21, 1830; Vol VI., p. 828,)—and mentions a case in which he was concerned, and which was tried at the Old Bailey, in which it was supposed, "in consequence of previous professional opinions, that it was the venereal disease; the child was questioned and interrogated, until, I believe, from fear and apprehension, she gave in to the idea that had been suggested and strongly entertained by the parents, and said that a certain youth had done something or other to her." As the learned author did not mention, in the work referred to, what the result of the trial was, I lately wrote to him, and received the following answer:—"I can, however, inform you, that the accused person, who was of respectable family and character, was acquitted. I do not know that there is any legal report of the case. The child was not seen by me until the ulcerations, which had been extensive and deep, were cicatrised. The affection had been pronounced to be

(a) See Beck's Medical Jurisprudence.

venereal by a general practitioner, who was first called in; and this opinion was corroborated by a surgeon of some eminence, although not connected with an hospital. The matter was first brought before the police-office in Bow-street, where the magistrate—the late Sir Richard Birnie—having inquired very carefully into all the circumstances, and heard my decided opinion respecting the nature of the disease, and its entire want of resemblance to syphilis, dismissed the complaint. The friends of the child, however, still trusting to the different view of the two gentlemen first consulted, brought the matter before the Criminal Court at the Old Bailey, where the Judge, having heard my evidence, and looked at the paper of Kinder Wood, in the *Medico-Chirurgical "Transactions,"* Vol. VII., to which I had referred, the Counsel soon stopped the case. I have since seen many instances of this affection, of which the local symptoms are often severe; but, in my experience, it has not been so serious as in that of Mr. Wood, nor in any instance fatal."

One of the latest authorities upon this subject is Mr. Kesteven, of London, who, in the *Medical Gazette* for February 28, 1851, has recorded a case of this very nature, and attached thereto some practical and useful observations, from which the following is an extract. With reference to the physical indications of chastity, the medical opinion upon which he says may be divided into two classes, the public and private, the former, or the most frequent, "are those in which vaginal discharges in young children are mistaken by the parents or friends for the evidences of sexual intercourse by elder male persons, having gonorrhœa or syphilis. Such cases have frequently occurred to myself, as they have to others; and, although now better understood by the Profession than formerly, yet so strong is often the notion entertained by the public with regard to these cases, that it is not unfrequently extremely difficult to persuade parents that we have merely to deal with the results of ordinary disease, and not with those of violence. This notion, in several cases that have come under my notice, has unfortunately been *confirmed by hasty and erroneous opinions*, given by surgeons on the mere representation of the friends, without a proper examination having been made. *It is scarcely possible to speak too severely of such culpable and wilful ignorance.* Within the last few weeks, a child of nine years of age was brought to me, upon whom it was suspected that violence had been inflicted. A careful examination afforded evidence that the case was simply one of vaginitis. There was complete absence of any indication of violence, for although it can scarcely be believed to be possible that sexual entrance into the vagina of an infant could, under any circumstances, be perpetrated; yet in the *attempt*, much

contusion of the young and delicate soft parts *must have ensued*, had it been made. The parents were satisfied, and an individual unjustly suspected was forthwith released from so odious an imputation."

What might have been the result had Cosgrave's case gone to the jury,—or what would have been the charge of the Lord Chief-Justice, it is difficult to say; but it was quite manifest that the Court held the medical opinions for the defence at a discount. Conversing with some of the most intelligent of the jury, they informed me, that independently of the *alibi*, they were strongly inclined to an acquittal on account of the contradiction of the Crown witnesses; and that being conversant with such cases they made it a rule to acquit where the man was not diseased.

With respect to the *alibi*, which, like all similar evidence, must be a matter of the merest chance,—but was here the means of saving the prisoner where medical evidence was not receivable,—it was so far useful in assisting the public to come to a proper conclusion as to the veracity of the witnesses produced by the Crown.

Several questions of grave importance are suggested by the foregoing details,—and first, with regard to the original propagation of such cases in a pathological as well as an ethical point of view. The disease, although denominated by Churchill and other modern writers upon the diseases of children, *leucorrhœa infantilis*, is better designated by the term *vaginitis*, for it is of a much more inflammatory character than either leucorrhœa or gonorrhœa, at least as these two diseases present in the adult female; and the discharge is much more profuse in the former, and much more purulent in the latter. This discharge proceeds principally from the vagina, although the external parts are generally bathed with it when we come to examine them, in the same way as the surface of the glands and the inside of the prepuce are usually covered with discharge, in persons labouring under gonorrhœa, particularly where the foreskin is abundant. The redness and swelling of the labia, clitoris, and orifice of the vagina, is generally very great, and the hue of the former is somewhat purplish. Not being acquainted with the appearance of gonorrhœa in children under 10 years of age, I cannot say whether the inflammatory symptoms are equal in appearance to those now described. The disease is, I believe, usually painless in the first instance; and it is only when excoriation has taken place from the irritation of the discharge, and that the urine passing over the abraded surface produces some degree of soreness, that any complaint is made. After some time, the period varying according to the virulence of the disease, and the state of cleanliness or the contrary in which the child is kept, the discharge excoriates the labia

both on their external and internal surfaces, the fourchette, perineum, the margin of the anus, and all that portion of the integument of the thighs washed by the discharge, or which come in contact when moved one upon another. In fat children, the amount and extent of excoriation, which presents much the character of an eczematous eruption, is always greater than in those who are thin, or have been in any way wasted by previous ill-health. The extent of this eruption is generally very well marked by a defined eczematous margin, extending from the pudendum, in a crescentic form, over the thighs, and sometimes into the cleft of the nates. The character of this eruption, its *defined margin and extent*, may possibly, to a practised and unprejudiced eye, serve to distinguish this disease from the results either of violence or the mechanical irritation produced by the "friction of the penis" between the thighs and external labia, as was endeavoured to be proved by the Crown in the late trials in Green-street.

With respect to the discharge, it is generally of a very acrid nature, and is the cause of this excoriation and eruption upon the true skin; and, unless the disease has been discovered by accident in an earlier stage, (such as by observation of the child's linen, or by the chance of some second party seeing the child,)—the two circumstances which first attract attention are, the difficulty of walking, or the pain in making water; but the date of the discovery varies from a few days to several weeks, according to the violence of the affection or the care and attention bestowed by mothers on their children. For the same reasons the duration of the disease will vary from a fortnight to six weeks, or two months. The age at which this vaginitis is most frequent is, from four to ten, but it may appear earlier, of which an example was given in the "Association Medical Journal" for August 27, extracted from the *Deutsche Klinik*, in which this disease appeared in a child only five months old, and produced inflammation of the lymphatics, and violent constitutional symptoms. The causes of the disease have been already explained in the foregoing portion of this tract. The little patient is generally pale, and looks out of health; the tongue is almost invariably white; and there is usually some loss of appetite. The treatment consists in extreme cleanliness, the use of mild astringent washes, attention to the state of the digestive organs, the administration of bark and other tonics, and the removal to a more healthy atmosphere. Where the disease has been of long standing, as in the case of the child Cosgrave, and the excoriation and superficial ulceration has proceeded to any depth, the parts bled freely, even with handling; and, therefore, if such friction as the medical witness swore might have taken place,

and, as the Crown wished to prove, had really occurred *while the child was labouring under the disease*, very great pain must have been experienced, and considerable hæmorrhage ensued.

Is the disease communicable by infection? Professors Cusack and Geoghegan think it is; (a) and their evidence proves this. If it be, and that the accused man has no disease, it ought in the minds of dispassionate persons to go far in exculpating him. Suppose, however, that the unfortunate man accused of the crime happens to have gonorrhœa, what will be his defence? This is a very serious question, which I submit to the ingenuity of medical jurists, and to practitioners acquainted with the appearances of gonorrhœa and also of vaginitis in young children.

Regarding the infectiousness of this disease I would refer the reader to a paper by Mr. Moss, of Windsor, published in the *Lancet* for December 19, 1835, p. 448. The disease affected two little girls and a boy; and the grandmother, a woman, aged sixty-six, who resided in the same house with them, "was afflicted with one of the most frightful attacks of purulent ophthalmia."

Under two circumstances only is the violation of a child of tender years likely to be attempted;—to get rid of disease by instantaneous transmission upon the application of the male to the female genital organs, under the ignorant delusion to which I have already referred; or for the gratification of sensual lust. In the former case, the man's passions need in nowise be affected; he may, as I endeavoured to explain to the Court at the late trials (because I have known such to occur), simply apply the penis to the genitals of the child, as (in his opinion) a sanitary measure; and thus a rape would, in the eye of the law, be consummated, and the disease be communicated; whereas, in the latter, with aroused passions, a certain amount of violence (even without penetration, which is scarcely possible) must be inflicted upon the labia and external parts, and evidences of which would be unmistakeable.

Suppose, however, that the violator was careful enough (as in the five cases tried at Dublin) to avoid rupturing the hymen, but simply to have recourse to the "friction" with the penis, sworn to by the medical officer of the Crown, would the consequences thereof be a profuse vaginal discharge, such as that seen in the cases which recently formed the subject of investigation here? Or, again, if the discharge proceeds only from the external parts and the true skin,

(a) In the instructions which I gave the lawyers for the defence in Kane's case, I pressed them to ask this question; but they said they were afraid of it. As lawyers, they had nothing to do with the medical question, or the elucidation of truth; they had only to "get off the prisoner."

must not such discharge be the result of suppuration consequent upon extreme violence, laceration, and contusion, such as would attract the attention of the mothers and friends, long before such discharge was established, no matter how willing children might be to conceal the act? Would not some hæmorrhage or other marks of violence be apparent on the dress? Could children so treated have pursued their ordinary play without complaint, or walked, as one of these did, a couple of miles immediately after the committal of the crime? Would it not be, to say the least of it, a very remarkable coincidence—taking up the opinion of the Crown—that each of the five children said to be violated should happen to be at the moment labouring under this well-known affection called “vaginitis,” or “leucorrhœa infantilis”? These are medical questions worthy the consideration of the Practitioner and the medico-legal jurist, although they may not be appreciated or understood by lawyers; but there are other questions which intimately concern the police, the Crown lawyers, and the country at large, a few of which I will here briefly state.

Have any cases, in which the crime of violation upon a child of tender years has been fully and satisfactorily proved, resembled those which formed the subject of this communication; where, in each instance, the state of the child was *accidentally* discovered many days after the date assigned to the commission of the crime? and are any of the signs of rape laid down by medical jurists, either in the infant or adult, similar to those which presented in the five Dublin cases? With respect to “corroborative evidence,” such, I believe, can always be procured, because, in most instances, the threatened or tortured child simply acknowledges to the fact of sitting upon the accused’s lap, being in his company, or having received some trivial act of kindness from him, at the time and place when the crime is alleged to have occurred; and plenty of witnesses can always be procured to corroborate these facts.

How does it happen, that in no instance does the child ever tell what has occurred until interrogated or threatened by the mother? She has neither love nor lust to influence her. She has no feeling of shame to cause her to withhold the desired information; and yet it is supposed that, for a “bit of sugar,” or a “pennyworth of strawberries,” she (who may have been heretofore truthful, affectionate, and obedient,) will withhold from her friends the name of her ravisher for days together, or until compelled to give it up by threats or punishment; or that she only remembers the name when mentioned to her? With regard to the veracity of children, much might be written, did space permit; but all who are acquainted with human nature know with what pertinacity they will adhere to a lie equally with the truth; and as a

certain amount of latitude is given by the Court and the jury to children, lawyers say they are "dangerous witnesses" to cross-examine. Those who practise medicine much among the lower orders can bear testimony to the difficulty of eliciting the truth about the most ordinary accident or disease among young children.

Generally speaking, the mothers are themselves fully convinced of the commission of the crime, and are therefore not only most justly indignant, but are anxious, by every possible means to have the accused party punished. One can therefore understand how persons in their rank of life will, by constantly going over the case with a child, prompting it when it forgets, and suggesting to it when it comes to the recital of the commission of the act, not only persuade the child into the positive belief of the occurrence, but also tutor it into details such as few prostitutes would be willing to recite. (Such really occurred in the case of *Walsh v. Barber*.) These infatuated mothers are much to be pitied, more particularly when the police, the Medical examiner, (who should, in such cases, be the guardian of their honour,) and the law-officers of the Crown, support them in their mistaken idea. They should be shown the moral injury they are inflicting on their children—forcing them, under the threat of torture, to lie; demoralising their young minds, by tutoring them into descriptions of scenes of immorality; exposing them in public Courts, and attaching to them in after life the stigma,—one which will not be forgotten among their friends and neighbours,—that they were violated and diseased. Lawyers must be shown, that all these cases are got up by a systematic procedure on the part of the mothers, and that, in nine cases out of ten, that procedure is but a paraphrase of the scene so graphically described by Sir Astley Cooper. So long, however, as such cases are entertained by the police, supported by medical testimony, and brought forward by the Crown prosecutor, so long will they continue to disgrace science, morality, and justice. But then, it must be remembered, that, with the exception of the presiding magistrate, each person concerned in the trial has a special interest therein. Having once taken up the case, the police, no doubt with the best intentions, endeavour to show that crime has been committed. The Medical-officer of the police is not only paid for the examination, and the subsequent examination at Court, but, being himself a policeman, looks with a jaundiced eye upon all accused persons. The Crown solicitor receives his salary, and all his clerks and officers are paid for their briefs, and what is called "the getting up of the case." The Attorney-General is paid his fee, and all the Crown lawyers are paid their fees—the country pays for all. Where does the fault lie? I believe in the police-office. If the cases were pro-

perly investigated there, all this unnecessary expense, all this disgrace toward the accusers, and unjust accusation of the accused, might be avoided. The system of medical police in this country is lamentably defective; and of this we have had examples in this and in other trials of recent date, and which have served to bring medical evidence into disrepute, not only with the lawyers, but with the public. I conceive it to be the duty, as I have already stated elsewhere,^(a) of the medical adviser of the police, not only to be well acquainted with the jurisprudence of the case he is required to investigate, but "to afford *negative* as well as positive evidence, and to inform the magistrate, when cases like those under discussion are submitted to his inspection, that the disease which, to use the words" of Dr. Ireland after the late trials had taken place, "gave rise to the *unnatural* suspicion of the mother," affords of itself no evidence of attempted violence, but is an affection peculiar to a certain class of children. The magistrates had, I think, in the case of Barber, insufficient evidence to send it for trial, the child having sworn that the crime was committed in a public hall in the erect position while her feet were on the ground, and by a man six feet high, who was perfectly free from disease, whereas she (the doctor said) was labouring under gonorrhœa.

In conclusion, I do not think it necessary to offer any apology to my readers for this lengthened recital, which I have made solely upon public grounds, and with a well-founded hope that it will be the means of causing a stricter investigation into such cases for the future, while it can in nowise assist to clear the guilty where the crime has been absolutely committed, as no doubt it often is. The works on medical jurisprudence, both in English and other languages, contain the records of many cases similar to those which I have described; but, in addition to those already referred to, I would call the attention of my readers to the following extracts:—In Mr. Kinder Wood's "History of a very Fatal Affection of the Pudendum," published in 1816, to which I have already alluded, he says: "There is one point of view in which a consideration of this disease is highly important. The instances in which parents, on behalf of children, bring forward individuals upon the charge of rape are *disgustingly frequent*; and it can scarcely be doubted that this disease has been frequently considered in court as evidence of violence and venereal infection; inflammation, ulceration, and discharge, having always had particular attention in a consideration of the evidence." Armstrong and Underwood, in their works upon Diseases of Children, both appear to have been acquainted with this affection. The late Pro-

(a) See letter published in the *Freeman's Journal* for Aug. 9, 1853.

fessor Thomson, in his lectures on Medical Jurisprudence, says, "The most erroneous and dangerous conclusions may be drawn from a superficial view of these symptoms, and an ignorance of the disease. . . . In two instances little girls were brought to me by their mothers, under the supposition that they had been injured by men, who were openly accused of the crime; but I had no difficulty in satisfying the parents of their error, by sending for the men and examining them; in both instances they were free from disease." *Lancet* for December 24, 1836.

Dr. Ryan, in his "Manual of Medical Jurisprudence," gives the following judicious notice of this disease:—"Every well-informed physician and surgeon is conversant with the purulent discharge of female children of scrofulous and delicate habits, from the period of dentition to the age of puberty; such discharge is seen almost every day, in dispensary and hospital practice among the poor. It is described by John Hunter, Hamilton, Astley Cooper, Dewees, Jewel, and the author himself, and is often mistaken by ignorant practitioners for gonorrhœa," p. 183.

Capuron relates cases similar to the foregoing as having occurred at Paris; and Darwall says, "Judging from my own experience in a large town, cases like those related by Capuron are by no means unfrequent. I have met with at least a dozen during the last five or six years, principally in children four or five years of age."—(See also a case related by Dupuytren in the *Medico-Chirurgical Review*, vol. xxvi. p. 524.) Foderê mentions a case which occurred at Martigues in 1808, in which a grandmother accused eight or ten of the principal persons in the place of having violated a little child nine and a half years old. In that case an attempt was made to produce the appearance of violation, but it was detected, and the conspiracy exposed by the eminent authority to whom I have referred. Dr. Davis, in his "Obstetric Medicine," p. 78, mentions a case in which, in a country town in Wales, a child about eight years of age was "induced to prefer against a respectable minister of religion an accusation of an attempt to violate her person. It was averred on the part of her friends, that she became the subject of ulcerations of the pudendum in consequence of the imputed assault, and the gentleman in question was committed to prison, and confined there for several weeks. The grand jury ignored the bill, on the ground that the prisoner had proved himself free from the disease which he had been accused of communicating, and also from other and conclusive moral and circumstantial evidence. The ulcerations on the child's pudendum were proved not to have been derived from a venereal source."

The disease is much more common in towns than in rural districts, but it sometimes occurs in the latter. The follow-

ing case, which has been forwarded to me by Dr. Hynes, of Kinvara, is worthy of note. After alluding to several cases which occurred in his practice, he gives the history of a girl, aged between nine and ten, the daughter of a police constable, who had an attack of purulent vaginitis during the month of July for two successive years; and upon his expressing surprise to the mother at the circumstance, she told him that she herself had suffered from the same affection every year since she was six years old.

These, as well as all the foregoing references which I have given, in addition to that of Sir Astley Cooper, quoted at length in the introduction, will, I trust, assist to convince (if anything can convince) the police authorities and the lawyers, that neither the disease which I have described, nor the accusations which have been made, are of rare occurrence; and that the one has followed as the almost invariable consequence of the other. I shall now conclude with the following extract from the work of Dr. Taylor, at present the highest authority in England: "The existence of a purulent discharge from the vagina has been erroneously adduced as a sign of rape in these young subjects. The parents, or other ignorant persons who examined the child, often look upon this as a positive proof of impure intercourse, and perhaps lay a charge against an innocent person, who may have been observed to take particular notice of the child. Some cases are reported, by which it would appear, that individuals have thus narrowly escaped conviction for a crime which really had not been perpetrated. It is met with in girls up to six or seven years of age; and children thus affected have been tutored to lay imputations against innocent persons. This state may commonly be distinguished from the effects of violence by the hymen being entire,—the non-dilation or laceration of the vagina, (a) — the red and inflamed condition of the mucous membrane, and the abundance of the purulent discharge, which is commonly much greater than that which takes place as a result of violence. Capuron mentions two cases in which charges of rape on children were falsely made against innocent persons on account of the existence of a purulent discharge, the nature of which had been mistaken.

"As a summary of these remarks with respect to purulent discharges, we may observe, that they should never be admitted as furnishing corroborative evidence of rape, except: 1. When the accused party is labouring under gonorrhœal discharge. 2. When the date of its appearance in the child is from the third to the eighth day after the alleged intercourse. 3. When it has been satisfactorily established that

(a) Is it possible to dilate a child's vagina without rupture of the hymen?

the child had not previously to the assault any such discharge. It may be said, however, that all these conditions may exist, and yet the prisoner be innocent, for a child may, either through mistake or design, accuse an innocent person."—P. 581.

Had these tests been applied in the first instance to the five cases brought forward in Dublin, they would in all probability never have come to trial; but, on the one hand, the police examiner stated, that he formed his opinion irrespective of that of any other surgeon; and the Crown lawyers and the judges would still have informed us,—as the Lord Chief Justice did respecting Sir Astley Cooper's statement,—that it was only a medical opinion, and not law.

There is only one other subject which, though scarcely worthy of notice, suggests itself from the foregoing inquiry, but, as it might hereafter form a precedent for lawyers, it is worthy of examination. The police adviser swore in his informations, that the whole assemblage of symptoms seen in the children Cosgrave and Delmere "might result from riding on a stick." Now, I have searched carefully through medical and medico-legal works, and I have also inquired very extensively among my friends, and I cannot find a single instance of a disease resembling infantile vaginitis produced by this amusement.

The foregoing statement has been reprinted, with a few additions, from the *Medical Times and Gazette*.

The following is a copy of the list of Questions which I addressed to Messrs. Cusack, Geoghegan, Churchill, and Hatchell, upon the 25th of July, immediately after they had examined the children and the accused, and had read the informations alluded to at p. 12. It was the answers to these questions which chiefly induced me to undertake the defence of the prisoner Kane. These questions and answers also formed a portion of the statement which I offered to the Attorney-General, alluded to at p. 13.

With reference to the two children, Bridget Cosgrave, aged nine years, and Anne Delmere, aged about six, whom you have recently examined :

1. Please give a general description of the appearances which the genitals presented in both instances; and from what cause you think the disease has arisen?

2. How long do you think each child must have laboured under the affection which you then saw?

3. Do you think the appearances presented upon Sunday last could have been the result of violence attempted upon Friday, the 15th of this month?

4. Do you think the appearances which you saw were at all produced by carnal violence, or even the mechanical irritation of riding upon a stick?

5. Are such diseases as these children labour under common among the lower orders ; and to what cause are they generally attributable ?

6. What is the general impression of the parents or friends of such children on first discovering their diseased state ?

7. Do you know any popular impression among the lower orders with respect to the object in men having connection with infant children ?

8. Having examined the accused, Patrick Kane, please give your opinion of his state ?

9. Do you think it possible that any man could attempt the assault, such as that described in the informations of these children, in the state which they must have been in upon Friday, the 15th, without causing so much pain and subsequent soreness as not to have attracted the attention of their friends immediately after ; and do you think it likely that two children, treated with the violence described in their informations, would not have told it until it was discovered accidentally five days afterwards ?

10. What is your impression with respect to the veracity of children of such tender years so circumstanced, and threatened to be severely punished, as sworn by one of the mothers, that "she would cut her, and bring her to the doctor, unless she told her who *gave* her the disease" under which she laboured ?

11. Do you think it likely that the accused could have attempted connection with these children in the state which they must have been in at the period referred to without receiving infection ?

12. Could the vaginal discharge under which these children labour have been produced by attempts at violation without there were greater marks of external violence to be seen ?

Mr. Cusack's answer :—" I have read all the queries. I examined the children, in company with Drs. Churchill and Hatchell. I observed no marks of violence whatsoever on the pudendum of either child, and I am convinced no violence was ever attempted on either. Each child laboured under a local and purulent discharge from the genitals, with the inflammation usually attendant on such cases, aggravated by the neglect of ablution. Such cases were formerly the opprobrium of medical jurisprudence, as many innocent persons suffered the severest penalty of the law for offences never committed. I also examined the accused ; he is free from any disease whatsoever of the genitals. I am prepared to testify to the above on oath."

Professor Geoghegan's answer :—" In accordance with your request I herewith furnish the conclusion to which I have been led by a careful examination of both the children,

Cosgrave and Delmere, alleged to have been the subjects of a criminal attempt, and also of the accused.

"1. That the disease under which both children labour is the same, consisting in copious and purulent discharge, excoriation, bleeding readily upon slight friction; slight ulceration of the inner surface of the genitals, and chronic inflammation of the surrounding skin.

"2. The local characters of the disease in the children indicate that it is of some standing (possibly several weeks), and, in my opinion, are incompatible with the view that it could have originated but ten days previously to my examination.

"3. I do not believe the combination of appearances observed could have resulted from an attempted intercourse on the part of an undiseased man, nor in the assigned interval by one even labouring under gonorrhœa. Had the copious discharge been the result solely of a forcible criminal attempt, it would inevitably have been attended by collateral signs of violence of an unequivocal character, such as laceration or contusion, while the children would have been wholly incapacitated from subsequent exercise, &c., and hence the nature of the violence must have been speedily discovered.

"5. The disease of the children has, in my judgment, originated chiefly, if not exclusively, in want of attention to cleanliness, which, in the case of the child Cosgrave, is admitted by her mother.

"6 and 7. From the above considerations, it follows that the medical department of the inquiry affords no support to the allegation of attempted intercourse on the part of the accused. You are doubtless well aware that such a charge is often made erroneously, though without *mala fides*, by parents on the discovery of appearances of irritation in the genitals of female children, and their error is not unusually confirmed by the prevalent though unfounded opinion, that a gonorrhœa in the male may be got rid of by connection with a virgin female.

"8. That the accused, whom I have minutely examined (once quite unexpectedly), exhibits no evidence of genital disease.

"11. Had the accused attempted connection with children affected by the above disease, he might, in my opinion (if ignorant of its existence in them), have become himself contaminated, and exhibited signs of disease."

Dr. Churchill's answer:—"1. We first examined Anne Delmere. The external labia were excoriated, especially at their edges, but not very much so, and were smeared with yellowish puriform discharge, which was very acid, and also acrid, for it had excoriated a spot on each thigh, which had come in contact when the thighs were close together.

On separating the labia, the mucous membrane of the vulva was redder than usual, and bathed with yellowish puriform matter. The orifice of the vagina was of the usual size, with no marks of injury or violence. The excoriation extended between the buttocks to the anus, which appeared redder than natural, but neither ulcerated nor fissured. There were no condylomata. The general aspects of the parts gave me the impression that the disease was better than it had been. In Bridget Cosgrave we observed exactly similar appearances, but in a much less degree. There were no marks of violence or injury. The orifice of the vagina was perfectly natural, and there were neither fissures nor condylomata about the anus. The disease generally originates in want of cleanliness, or a bad state of constitution. It may prevail epidemically, either alone or during a general catarrh of the mucous membranes.

"2. It is scarcely possible to say how long the disease may have existed; as a general rule it is discovered by the mother shortly after it becomes troublesome.

"3 and 4. I do not think that the appearances could have been the result of violence offered to the child on the 15th, nor do I believe that they were such as would be produced by carnal violence. I have no knowledge of the appearances produced by riding on a stick.

"5. Quite common. They are both good specimens of infantile leucorrhœa, described by many authors, and generally depend upon a vitiated constitution, broken health, want of cleanliness, or improper food. It may also prevail epidemically.

"6. That violence has been offered to the child. I have been repeatedly consulted upon this point, in common with others whose practice lies much among children. Dr. Percival relates a remarkable case of this kind.

"7. There is a popular tradition, that a man may cure himself of an obstinate gonorrhœa by having connection with a child.

"8. Patrick Kane appeared perfectly free from disease. There were neither signs of gonorrhœa present nor of his having had the disease at all.

"9. The pain and soreness, the difficulty of walking and sitting which would follow violence to a young child, would have drawn forth some complaint, and certainly would have attracted the attention of the mother.

"10. A child who was told, or led to believe, that there was something shocking the matter with her, and who was threatened at the same time, might, I think, by the help of leading questions, be made to say anything the examiner pleased, and that, perhaps, without any positive intention of telling a lie.

"11. If, as I believe, the children have leucorrhœa and not gonorrhœa, connection with them would not communicate the latter, although, from the acrid nature of the discharge it would very likely irritate the male organ.

"12. I believe not. There was an entire *absence of evidences of violence*; there were no bruises, no laceration, nor even the appearance as if the vaginal orifice had been distended. In short, if I had been simply consulted about these cases, I should have told the mothers that they were cases of infantile leucorrhœa, a disease by no means uncommon, and depending upon want of care or a bad constitution; and that no inference of violence, or even of an attempted intercourse, could be admitted merely from the discharge," &c.

Dr. Hatchell's answer:—"1. There was an abundant purulent discharge from the genitals in both instances, staining the inner surface of the thighs considerably. The hymen was present. The vagina was neither dilated nor lacerated, and was perfectly free from marks of violence of any kind. It is my opinion the discharge was the result of an affection common to the children of the lower orders.

"2. I think these children must have been affected in the way I saw them for twelve or fourteen days at least.

"3. I do not think the appearances present on Monday, the 25th inst., were the result of violence at any time.

"4. I do not think the appearances I saw were produced by carnal or any other violence.

"5. Purulent discharges, such as these children labour under, are very common among the lower orders, and are attributable to strumous constitutions, intestinal worms, want of cleanliness, &c.

"6. The general impression of parents and friends of such children is, that they have been affected by some person labouring under gonorrhœa.

"7. I am aware that it is a prevalent notion among the lower orders, that connection with young children is a certain cure for gonorrhœa.

"8. When I examined Patrick Kane on Monday, the 25th inst., he was not affected with gonorrhœa; and from the appearance he then presented, it is my opinion he could not have been so for a considerable time previous.

"9. If these children had been assaulted in the way set forth in the information I read, I am of opinion, from the state they were then in, they must have suffered so much pain and soreness as to cause them to complain almost immediately afterwards. I think it very unlikely that children of their age, treated with the violence described, would, or could, have concealed their state for five days.

"10. My impression is, that children of such tender age can be frightened by threats, &c., to assert anything that is suggested to them, be it true or false.

"11. I am not certain if such discharges as these children labour under are infectious.

"12. I do not think that any discharge, not gonorrhœa or constitutional, could be produced without evident marks of violence."

Dr. Ireland's evidence before the Commission. (a) Examined by Mr. Corballis, Q.C.:—"I am a surgeon, and remember the child (Bridget Cosgrave) who was the first witness. I examined her private parts on the 23rd of July. I found a superficial inflammation, with a purulent discharge from the genitals, surrounded by a crust defining the suppuration. The parts were not inflamed very much, but sufficiently to produce suppuration. On making an examination the next day, in company with Dr. Geoghegan, a good deal of pressure was made on the vagina, and thereupon a leucorrhœal or white discharge was observed to come from the vagina itself. In my opinion, I do not think that a man's private parts could enter the vagina of this child; but the penis might go between the labia, which were the parts diseased. I cannot say what the nature of this disease was. It might have been produced by external irritation. The irritation produced by a man's penis might, I think, produce it. Such a discharge very often results either from neglect or from a strumous or scrofulous habit."

Cross-examined by Mr. Curran:—"I cannot say whether the disease was gonorrhœa or not, nor could I call it leucorrhœa; but it was such a discharge as might arise from dirt. On that day week I examined the prisoner (Patrick Kane), and could not find the slightest trace of excoriation upon his private parts. That examination took place on the 23rd of July, and was so strict, that if he had a gonorrhœal discharge a week before, I am certain that I would have discovered traces of it."

To the Court:—"I am of opinion that the discharge may have been produced by friction with the penis of a healthy man."

To Mr. Curran:—"I can distinctly swear that there was no penetration of the vagina in this instance."

Counsel then read a portion of Sir Astley Cooper's opinion, already referred to at p. 15, until interrupted by the Lord Chief Justice, who said it was not evidence, but only the opinion of a medical man. Counsel then asked the witness whether he concurred in its statements.

Dr. Ireland:—"I perfectly concur in everything stated by Sir Astley Cooper in that extract; but in the present case I have formed my opinion without reference to the views of any other surgeon."

(a) This, and all the rest of the evidence alluded to in the foregoing portion of this Report, was taken down in short-hand by Mr. Chamley, of the "Saunders' News Letter." I still possess his manuscript..

Evidence of Mr. Cusack. Examined by Mr. Curran :—
 “I recollect examining this child on the 24th or 25th of July. Dr. Churchill was with me during the examination. I examined her private parts very minutely. I examined two children at the same time (Bridget Cosgrave being one of them), and both were affected with the same complaint. They were filthy, and had a discharge from the pudendum. There was a crust surrounding the parts on the true skin, which arose from the deposits of the discharge. This child had not the slightest mark of violence, and it was simply a case of disease which all medical men have met with, and which is very common among children who are strumous, or badly cared for, or who have been in contact with each other. It is usually found in low life ; but sometimes it is found in the better walks of life, where children have suffered from other complaints tending to weaken the constitution ; and I confess I was horror-struck at the time, to hear that the prisoner at the bar was accused of such a crime. *I am convinced as I am of my existence, that there was no violence offered or attempted on this child*, and that this is a common disease which is universally known to the profession. I conversed with Sir Astley Cooper on this very subject, and I entirely concur with what appears in his Lectures, that numbers have suffered unjustly from such charges as the present being fabricated by the mothers of children.”

To the Lord Chief Justice :—“I say it is an actual impossibility that violence could have been used with this child, and I told her mother so.”

Cross-examined by Mr. Smyley :—“May there not have been a penetration between the labia, accompanied with force, but not sufficient to do any injury to the surface? In short, might not a person penetrate the labia without leaving any appearance of force or injury, though, in point of fact, force to some extent had been used?”

Witness :—“The labia are perfectly loose, and can be separated for the purposes of examination. I could not say that a finger or a penis had not been in contact with the labia ; but how is the fact to be proved? I saw nothing to prove it.”

To Chief Justice Monahan :—“If your Lordship knew the anatomy of the parts, you would find that the labia are so loosely connected, that nothing but considerable violence would leave a trace of injury upon them. But I was speaking before of the entrance of the vagina.”

Chief Justice Monahan :—“But the law says, that if there be an entrance within the labia, a crime is committed.”

Witness to Mr. Curran :—“I would not call the mere separation of the labia a penetration. If the penis were brought into contact with the parts, and a discharge ensued in consequence, it would certainly be a species of violence ;

but in the present case, there was nothing to show me that any friction had taken place externally, or that any attempt had been made to do any wrong. *I am confident that the discharge was not in any respect the consequence of friction from the penis of any man.* If there was violence, it would cause pain; but I could find no traces of violence upon this child."

Professor Geoghegan bore the following testimony:—"I found on the genitals a chronic disease of, I should say, several weeks' standing; in my opinion, it was not possible that the disease could be of one week's standing, and I am further of opinion that the disease would not have resulted from violence on the part of any undiseased man..... If violence had been committed upon this child by a man lying on her upon the hay, so as to hurt her in that way, I think she would not be able to walk over to Ship-street in the evening, and home again the next morning." (a)

In cross-examination by Mr. Corballis, he also stated:—"In my opinion, friction by a man against the private parts of a child could not possibly have produced the disease I saw; because, first, it was of long standing, and, secondly, if there had been sufficient violence to produce such a copious discharge, it would have produced other symptoms that were not present in this instance."

Mr. Corballis:—"Is it possible that, supposing the child to have had this disease at the time of the alleged offence, a man might, on the 15th of July, have introduced the extremity of his penis between the labia, and no further?"

"It is; but if such an attempt were made, considering the great disparity of the parts in the man and child, I think it could not be done without a certain degree of laceration."

Dr. Churchill's evidence was similar to that of the foregoing. He was cross-examined by Mr. Smyley, Q.C., as to the possibility of penetration, in the legal acceptation of the term, and so as not to give pain. The witness said, "I think penetration in a child so young, and where the organs are so disproportioned, would give pain."

(a) Both the prosecutrix herself and her mother and sister swore that she walked to Ship-street shortly after the offence was committed, and returned next day.