Right Corpus Striatum.—The diseased condition of the vessels was more thoroughly marked in this position than in any other, and the capillaries were likewise very strongly defined. The muscular coat of one artery was seen to be at least four times thicker than normal. There was a general increase of the nuclei of the neuroglia.

Left Corpus Striatum.—In a portion taken from the neighbourhood of the degenerated tract a similar condition of the vessels was found. It may be generally stated that the nearer one approached to the diseased tracts the more marked was the disease of the vessels. Immense deposits of hæmatoidine were found immediately below the ependyma ventriculorum and in the perivascular canals.

Pons.—The vessels were much affected in a manner similar to the condition already described. The large cells were immensely affected with fuscous degeneration. The transverse fibres were of a yellowish tint, refusing to take on colouring matter. The same description applies to the medulla oblongata.

Spinal Cord.—Vessels were markedly affected. Cells of the posterior vesicular column were seen to have undergone partial or complete fuscous degeneration. In the posterior column large deposits of true corpora amylacea were found. The specimens taken from all parts readily absorbed carmine.

OCCASIONAL NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

The Budget and Pauper Lunatics.

As might have been expected, the advent of a Conservative Government was the signal for an attempt being made to relieve local taxation; and the overwhelming majority by which Sir Massey Lopes' resolutions on this subject were passed two years ago, pointed to the maintenance of pauper lunatics as being one of the burdens that should be partially, or entirely, removed from local, and placed on imperial taxation. Accordingly, in the Budget introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 16th of April last, it was proposed that four shillings a week should be paid from imperial resources to each union in the United Kingdom, for every lunatic in the county or borough asylums, and subsequently Sir Stafford Northcote fully explained that this subsidy would not be allowed either for pauper lunatics in lunatic wards of workhouses, or for lunatics boarded out with friends or others, or for those in the Metropolitan Asylums at Leavesden, Caterham, and Hampstead. The arguments for and against this scheme are rather nicely balanced, and until it has had an extended trial of three or four years it will be difficult to

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.20.90.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

decide whether its effects will be good or bad. It has been surmised that the result will be to induce Boards of Guardians to direct their officials to send acute and recent cases of insanity at once to the asylum, instead of retaining them, as is too frequently done, in the workhouse, until they become chronic; but it seems to have been forgotten that the union medical officer is the person who usually decides on the course to be adopted, and, moreover, that if the guardians are induced by the proposed subsidy to order acute cases to be sent at once to the asylums, the same motives will also prompt them to send off the idiots, imbeciles, and troublesome and chronic lunatics, now in workhouses or boarded out.

It appears to us that this would be an evil of great magnitude. It may, and indeed no doubt is, a matter of question whether any lunatics should be retained in workhouses, but that all the county asylums should be crowded up with idiots, dements, and imbeciles would be intolerable. Why should the County Lunatic Asylums be treated in this respect so differently from the County Hospitals? Are cases of physical disease, after they become chronic, ever allowed to remain in ordinary hospitals? Certainly not. If workhouse wards are not proper receptacles for chronic and harmless lunatics, and if they do not receive proper skilled medical treatment therein, let such asylums as those of Caterham and Leavesden, which for their purpose are admirable, be multiplied throughout the land; but we hope the day is far off on which it will be incumbent on the county asylums to receive all cases of insanity. Unless, however, the Government proposal be considerably modified next year, when the subject of local taxation is again to be brought forward, there is every prospect of the fears above stated being verified.

After all, however, the question, as is the case with most sublunary matters in these practical days, will in all probability resolve itself into one of money. If the local authorities find that it will be more immediately economical to send their insane poor to the county asylum rather than to retain them in the union houses, they will not be deterred by any ulterior fears of the county authorities having to enlarge the asylum from doing so. The effects of the passing of the Irremovable Poor Act of 1861 have been often adduced as an instance of this short-sighted policy of local authorities of limited areas.

This Act, we need scarcely remind our readers, was passed for the purpose of transferring the chargeability of lunatics from the parish poor rates to the common fund of the unions,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.20.90.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and though no immediate effect was apparent, in the course of two or three years the admissions in asylums were largely increased. This is only what might be expected. Thought in Bumbledom is of slow growth, and it would take a year or two for guardians to get the workings of a new act into their heads.

In No. LXIX. of this Journal, in an article on "The alleged Increase of Lunacy," appears the following paragraph and table. We are not aware that the facts therein stated have ever been successfully refuted:—

The large annual increase of admissions in 1863-4 and 1864-5 are doubtless connected with the operation of the provision of the Irremovable Poor Act of 1861, which placed the cost of the maintenance of pauper lunatics on the common fund of the union, and removed the inducement in individual parishes to retain their insane poor at home, with a view of saving the local rates.

TABLE showing the ratio per cent. in the Increase of the admissions into the Asylums of England and Wales in the decennium, 1858—68.

YEARS.	Ratio of increase per cent. in the admissions into asylums.
1858—9	11·7 per cent. increase.
1859—60	1·5 „ increase.
1860—61	3·7 „ *decrease.*
1861—62	1·6 „ *decrease.*
1862—63	2·4 „ increase.
Average annual increase in the five years, 1858—63	1·2 „ increase.
1863—64	9·4 „ increase.
1864—65	10·4 „ increase.
1865—66	3·6 „ *decrease.*
1866—67	5·2 „ increase.
Average annual increase in the four years, 1863—67	5·3 „ increase.
Average annual increase in the nine years, 1858—67	3·0 „ increase.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.20.90.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Chancellor of the Exchequer has recently stated to a deputation that he thought the fear of having to spend money on enlarging the asylums, if the chronic cases were crowded into them, would deter the Guardians from adopting so suicidal a course. But if parishes were not deterred in 1861, unions are not likely to act differently in 1874. Besides, having to pay a slightly increased county rate of, say one farthing, for the enlargement of the asylum, would be repaid amply by the four shillings per week per patient they are to receive. Thus, for example, the County of Blankshire has one thousand lunatics; of these six hundred and fifty are in the asylum. To provide asylum accommodation for the other three hundred and fifty would cost, at the most, £100 a bed, say £35,000. But, having complied with the Chancellor's requirements, the union authorities would be entitled to four shillings a week (equal to £3,640 a year) for each of these three hundred and fifty patients now sent to the asylum. So that the cost of enlarging the asylum would be refunded to them in less than ten years, and they would be relieved of the annoyance and trouble lunatics in the union houses cause them and their officials.

All this, however, might be avoided if, as was recently proposed in a letter to the "Times," the imperial treasury, instead of paying the subsidy direct to the Guardians for the relief of the maintenance rate, was to hand it over to the Visiting Justices for the purpose of maintaining the fabric of the asylums, &c. If this course could be adopted, all the old incentives to economy would be maintained, and the inducement to local authorities to send harmless lunatics and idiots to the asylums would be no greater than at present.

Dr. Fraser, of the Fife and Kinross Asylum, had an instructive letter on this subject in a recent number of a medical contemporary, in which he showed that the very successful plan of boarding out lunatics, adopted in some parts of Scotland, would, in all probability, be completely stopped by the provision of the budget now under discussion, for it would be as cheap, and much less trouble, for the local authorities to maintain their lunatics in the asylums, and he adduced an instance which had lately occurred, wherein the district authorities had already declined to remove a harmless lunatic from his asylum.

There is, however, yet another temptation which this subsidy will hold out to workhouse authorities and officials. In nearly every workhouse there are at all times one or more

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.20.90.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bed-ridden, paralysed, dirty cases sufficiently insane to be certified as such. These have generally ended their days in the workhouses, as the officials would not have dared to face out before the Board of Guardians the expense of sending them to the asylum. But now it will be decidedly cheaper, and a great saving of trouble, to pack them off to the county asylums, where the only effect their advent will have, will be that of raising the mortality per-centages. A pleasant prospect this for the asylums. And to show that these fears are not chimerical, it may be stated that in an asylum with which we are acquainted, out of 35 admissions from April 10th to June 1st, thirteen were so far advanced in disease that five died within a few days of admission, and the other eight cannot last more than a month or two. Three of the rest were idiots. During the corresponding period of last year there were exactly the same number of admissions, but only seven were advanced in disease, and none died. This may only be a coincidence, but it looks suspicious. At all events we think that we have presented matter for grave consideration.

Insanity and Divorce.

Out of five judges three have answered in the negative, and two in the affirmative, the question put to them by the House of Lords in the Mordaunt case. The question was, whether the insanity of one of the parties in a divorce suit should preclude the other party from going on with his suit. Lady Mordaunt having been pronounced insane, the judge of the Divorce Court had decided that the insanity was, so long as it continued, a bar to the husband's prosecution of his suit to obtain a divorce on the ground of adultery; and this ruling was subsequently confirmed by a majority of judges in the full Court of Probate and Divorce—that is, we believe, by two out of three judges. Sir Charles Mordaunt appealed against this decision to the House of Lords, which thereupon called in the assistance of the judges, who have illustrated their perplexity and the uncertainty of law by delivering elaborate judgments on opposite sides of the question. It now remains for the House of Lords to determine whether it will accept the opinion of the majority, in which case Sir Charles Mordaunt may prosecute his suit for a divorce, or that of the minority, when he must remain

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.20.90.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press