under the law as it has existed since 1861. His assumption that the conviction of the lunatic is necessary therefore rests on no better foundation than his assumption that a verdict of "guilty, but insane," is tantamount to a verdict of acquittal. It is to be hoped that there may be an early judicial revision of the Plaistow ruling.

The Attendants' Handbook.

We have received a copy of the third edition of the *Handbook for Attendants on the Insane*, published by authority of the Association. Drs. Hayes Newington and Beveridge Spence, to whom the matter was remitted, decided not to attempt a revision of the work, as the demand was so urgent and the publishers had none left in stock. They have, however, numbered the paragraphs so as to facilitate the answering of the questions to be found at the end of each chapter, and completed the book by adding the Regulations referring to the nursing examinations. As various suggestions have been made for further improvements, arrangements have been made with Messrs. Baillière, Tindall, and Cox to give timely notice when this new edition is approaching exhaustion, so that ample opportunity may be afforded for thorough revision prior to the issue of the fourth edition. Judging by past experience this will not be an affair of the dim and distant future. Meanwhile, we congratulate all concerned on the prompt appearance of this new issue in a serviceable form.

PART II.—REVIEWS.

The New Privy Council Rules.

According to the second section of the Act 30 and 31 Vic., c. 118, the Lord Lieutenant is empowered to make, by Order in Council, Rules and Regulations for the control and guidance of the officers and servants in the District Asylums of Ireland, as well as to determine the staff, appoint their salaries, and define their duties.

Accordingly from time to time a small blue-book has been issued containing the rules thus prepared, and commonly known as "the Privy Council Rules."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.359-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

These rules have often been the subject of comment in our columns, and we have not been always able to express uniform approval of their provisions. So long ago as April, 1875, we said of the first two editions: "On the whole, we cannot speak very highly of the tact or wisdom shown . . . in the framing of the new Code." On the present occasion it had been understood for about two years that the Privy Council Rules were under revision, and it was hoped that the revision would be of a thorough and satisfactory character. The result, however, in the form of a new edition, dated December 17, 1894, and published in the beginning of last year, has been disappointing.

There are in the new code, as in the later editions of the old, too many survivals from an earlier day. These may be necessary for the preservation of official continuity, but they certainly impair the present efficiency of the rules. In a body of "General Rules and Regulations for the Management of District Asylums" there are some curious omissions. Thus, the duties and position of the Inspectors of Lunatics are not defined or set out, though it is evident from the numerous references to those officials that their duties in connection with asylums are very heavy and multifarious, and their responsibilities enormous. Neither is anything said about the Board of Control of Lunatic Asylums, a body which appears to exercise absolute powers over everything connected with asylum estates and asylum buildings in Ireland. Nor can it be said that these omissions are accountable from the circumstance that neither Inspectors nor Board of Control belong to the staff of any asylum, inasmuch as the first division of the rules treats of the position and duties of the Board of Governors, a body generally resembling the English or Scottish Committee. The powers of these gentlemen in Ireland seem rather limited. The Board of Control, as above mentioned, are the owners of the property and buildings, in which the Governors would appear to have only a tenants' right. The strength and the cost of the staff is determined by the Lord Lieutenant, while "no resolution of the Board of Governors affecting the discipline or management of an asylum, as established by the present rules, shall take effect, if contrary to any of them, until after it shall have been submitted, through the Inspectors, to the Chief or Under Secretary, and shall have received the approval of the Lord Lieutenant" (Rule XII.) How far-reaching this regulation

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.359-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

is may be seen from the fact that under these rules the duties of the gardener, the gate-keeper, the laundress, and the cook are laid down, and even the hour at which the latter important functionary is to have "everything prepared for her business" is set forth. It is difficult to see how an institution is to be managed if such details as the last mentioned, and the hour at which the night attendants are to go on duty, are dealt with in this inelastic manner.

The section dealing with the admission of patients is very complex and difficult to understand. It is much to be regretted that some method cannot be adopted in Ireland by which all public patients could be admitted to District Asylums in the same way. As a matter of fact, most cases are admitted as dangerous lunatics or dangerous idiots under the terms of the Act 30 and 31 Vic., c. 118, but the method which appears to be contemplated as the ordinary or normal mode is by an application for admission made by a relative or guardian to the Board of Governors. With reference to this method, by which patients "shall be admitted," no power of refusal seems to be given to the Governors. In any case, as the Governors, save in exceptional circumstances, only meet once a month, and as the medical certificate accompanying the application probably only holds good for seven days from its date, it is evident that the Governors can rarely exercise any power in the matter. Special provision is made, however, that the Medical Officer may admit a patient "in case of urgency," pending the meeting of the Governors. It is laid down that the application form "is to be transmitted to the Resident Medical Superintendent at the time of the lunatic being sent to the Institution" (Form D). But, according to Rule XXIV., "on admission every patient shall be examined by a member of the medical staff, who shall satisfy himself of the legality and correctness of the admission form." Does this mean that he must satisfy himself that the patient is insane, thus acting as a sort of second certifying physician, or does it merely signify that he must satisfy himself of the formal correctness of the paper? Surely in either case this is not a responsibility which should be put upon him? He might be placed in a terrible dilemma if a patient was brought to the asylum whose insanity at a first interview was doubtful, or in the case of an incorrect admission form being "transmitted" to the asylum, together with a patient who was actively suicidal. In such cases he would appear not to be legally justified in taking the patient

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.359-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

in, and he might not be morally justified in sending him away. It is unfortunate that some mode of admission cannot be adopted in Ireland similar to the Magistrate's order in England or the Sheriff's order in Scotland, under which the Medical Officer of the Asylum would be tolerably safe.

We are inclined to think that the regulations with regard to recording the deaths of patients and disposal of the dead are capable of improvement. It is directed that notice of death in a specified form shall be sent within 48 hours to the Inspectors, to the relatives, to the Registrar of Deaths, and in certain cases to the Registrar in Lunacy. The form contains a statement of the cause of death as ascertained by post-mortem examination, but it is further provided that "Notice shall also be sent to the relations, or one of the relations aforesaid, to remove the body within three days after the date of posting of notice. If not so removed or if the body be not claimed, or if permission is given by the relation, or one of the relations aforesaid, it shall undergo a post-mortem or anatomical examination (in accordance with the Act 2 and 3 Wm. IV., cap. 75, section 7)."

There seems to be a confusion here, for the Anatomy Act says nothing about post-mortem examinations being merely intended to regulate the methods of procuring bodies for the dissecting-rooms and providing eventual interment for bodies used for anatomical purposes. It is much to be regretted that the Privy Council should have made this extraordinary mistake, and by quoting with regard to post-mortem examinations an Act of Parliament which has nothing to do with them, should have contributed to excite afresh the prejudice, already only too strong in Ireland, against autopsies. The importance of post-mortem examinations in asylums is now well recognised, and has been strongly insisted upon by the Inspectors. We are sure that if they had been consulted about this matter, they could have explained that an antopsy and an anatomical examination are totally different, and that the provisions for the burial of bodies from the dissecting-rooms in no way applies to every-day cases of post-mortem examination.

A number of new regulations, very similar to those of the English Commissioners, provide for notification to the Inspectors of the admission of patients, for the transmission to the same officers of copies of the admission orders and certificates, and also of a medical statement as to the patient's condition to be signed by a Medical Officer. There

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.359-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

is no provision for re-certification, which is not required by the Irish statutes. Minute and careful instructions are given as to keeping of a medical case book. A register of casualties is also provided, and a register of mechanical restraint.

A very important regulation provides that "there shall be appointed in every District Asylum in Ireland at least one Assistant Medical Officer." We are glad to learn that this rule has been regarded as mandatory, and that provision has been made, or is being made, in every asylum in Ireland to carry it out. We have no doubt that this great step is due to the influence of the Inspectors. We wish we could see their action more distinctly throughout this revised code, which in many respects seems to us to be wanting in the spirit which should influence those who compile regulations for great hospitals. We have given an example with regard to the rule about autopsies, and we think another is to be found in the following rule (XXXIX.):—The Medical Superintendent "shall within three days of the occurrence report to the Inspectors of Lunatics any injury to a patient found existing on admission, or received during residence in the asylum, any serious casualty, outbreak of zymotic or epidemic disease, or any other matter of serious importance to the welfare of the patients under his charge."

This is a purely official rule, which, as it stands, would be impossible to carry out. A "serious casualty" is certainly included in "any injury received by a patient," but so is a black eye, and it can hardly be meant that every bruise recorded in the casualty book in every asylum is to be reported to the Inspectors. How could these already overworked gentlemen attend to their business if they had to go into the details of "every injury," &c. Again, what is an outbreak of zymotic or epidemic disease? One case of typhoid or of influenza? or three or four cases of diarrhœa? Or, what is an epidemic? The Medical Officer of Health, where notification is compulsory, requires such a notice, but he carefully states from time to time what diseases he requires to be notified, and his requirements differ with the season. Here, as elsewhere, strict regulations to meet every possible case are medically impossible, and the effort to lay down hard and fast rules, adherence to which is not feasible, tends in no way to fix responsibility, which seems to be the foremost idea in the official mind, but on the contrary is apt to conduce to a spirit of carelessness.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.359-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

Altogether we think that the revised Privy Council Rules will bear further revision. We fail to see why a plan should not be adopted in Ireland similar to that existing in England, by which all matters not dealt with by statute or by the Commissioners' (Inspectors') regulations, and all matters connected with internal discipline should be regulated by a separate code of rules for each asylum, such code to receive the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant, as the English codes receive the sanction of the Home Secretary. It is impossible to deal fully and fairly with all the requirements of some twenty-one separate institutions in a code contained in about twenty-five octavo pages, even though an effort is made to touch on everything from the admission of a patient to his burial, from the Board of Governors to the gate porter. The result must be what it is—a sketchy and uneven piece of work, too detailed in some respects and too vague in others, containing matter which might be left out, and not supplying information which might be expected. Such a code handicaps those who have to work it, whether from without or from within.

Studies in the Evolutionary Psychology of Feeling. By HIRAM M. STANLEY, Member of the American Psychological Association; pp. 390. (Swan, Sonnenschein, & Co.)

It will become obvious after perusing a very few pages of this work that the author has a theory. That theory may be described as a desire to find a more complete reference of the complex colours of emotional psychoses, from the evolutionary point of view, to hedonalgic primaries, or, to state the matter more simply, to propound a pretty complete psychology of the feelings and emotions built upon a pleasure-pain basis. Albeit many of the chapters are reproduced from periodical publications, this idea prevails throughout, and we can promise any reader specially interested in the point that it is only too diligently worked out.

In a short preface the author states himself to be well aware of the fact that he traverses the moot points in psychology—"What points," he asks, "are not moot?" and, contradicting what we have said above, adds that he himself has "*no theory* to defend," trusting, however, that the "*position* taken will receive thorough criticism." That thorough criticism which he desires, and which we think he deserves,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.42.177.359-a Published online by Cambridge University Press