large consumers making up) the asylum community and the large consumers in the general community. I am advised by experienced engineers that among the latter (*e.g.*, the villa residents) 60 gallons per head per diem would be rather an under than an over-estimate.

10. In my opinion 40 gallons of water daily per head of the entire asylum community is decidedly too low an allowance for an asylum community of 300 persons. I doubt very much whether 50 gallons is enough. My experience leads me to recommend that for such a community 60 gallons should be regarded as the minimum quantity when a site for an asylum is being chosen, or when a Board is about to expend money upon, or to become a party to, any arrangement for the satisfactory supply of water to its asylum.

11. For a larger asylum probably a somewhat lower allowance per head would be sufficient; but it would appear from the figures given above that in any case the allowance must be a higher one than that proposed by the Lunacy Commissioners.

12. It should be clearly understood what is intended by the word "minimum." If the water supply is only occasionally restricted to an insufficient "minimum," no great hardship is caused; but no consumer expects to be limited to the "minimum" supply at all times. If the *minimum* supply is that which is procurable during three or four months of dry season yearly, then, to be satisfactory, it must be equivalent to a supply which is *sufficient* for all necessary and proper purposes.

LUNACY IN LONDON.

The London County Council has to encounter great difficulties in dealing with the yearly increasing numbers of insane patients. The Asylum Committee require to exercise skill, tact, discretion in no ordinary degree. Already the accommodation of the various asylums is overstrained, and that in spite of temporary measures. A "normal" rate of increase of 600 patients per annum is an appalling fact; but it must be faced. The whole question was considered at the Nottingham meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association, and we shall return to a consideration of the question on the publication of Dr. Rayner's paper on the "Housing of the Insane."

LUNACY IN EDINBURGH.

Edinburgh has been called upon to consider the impossibility of continuing the present arrangements in respect of the insufficiency of the accommodation for the pauper insane. A new asylum is to be built, and an order has been issued by the General Board of Lunacy, with the approval of the Secretary for Scotland, dividing the former Edinburgh City Lunacy District into two new districts. The pauper division of the Royal Edinburgh Asylum will thus be relieved of the pressure on its space by the removal of all patients chargeable to the parishes of Edinburgh, and will in future only receive cases from the parishes of Leith and Duddingston.

DUNDEE AND DUMFRIES ROYAL ASYLUM.

Some dissatisfaction has been expressed of late, in reference to the constitution of the Directorate of these Institutions. At Dundee, the proposal has been made that the Parish Council should acquire the asylum; while at Dumfries a Bill is being promoted in Parliament for the reconstruction of the Board of Management.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.43.181.426-b Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Dundee Parish Council urge that they could perform all the duties and care for the patients at a less cost than the present Directors. Dr. Sibbald, as Commissioner in Lunacy, some years ago, prepared a memorandum on the subject, which enters into the question as to the representation of Parish Councils upon the governing bodies of the Royal Asylums, and we produce, what purports to be an abstract of it, as given in the *Dundee Advertiser* of 4th March, 1897. He begins by giving a summary of the complaints made by the memorialists, which are to the effect that (1) the rates charged in the Royal Asylums for pauper lunatics are very much in excess of those charged in District Asylums; (2) in certain lunacy districts the Parochial Boards are precluded by Section 59 of the Lunacy Act of 1857, from building new asylums or sending their patients to any asylum except the Royal Asylums, and they are forced to submit to the charges made by the Royal Asylums; (3) upwards of one-half of the money expended on most of the Royal Asylums is collected from the ratepayers by Parochial Boards, and paid for the maintenance of pauper lunatics; (4) though the ratepayers look to the Parochial Boards as responsible for the expenditure of what they contribute to Royal Asylums, Parochial Boards are not represented on the management of Royal Asylums; (5) the governing bodies of Royal Asylums, not being publicly elected, do not take a due amount of interest in seeing to the economical administration of these funds. In reply to the statements of the memorialists, Dr. Sibbald states that it is in general true that the rates charged in Royal Asylums for pauper lunatics are in excess of the rates charged in District Asylums, in so far as regards what is paid for pauper lunatics out of the poor rate. But in order to judge whether that fact affords a fair basis of complaint it is necessary to understand what the rates charged in the two classes of asylums represent. In the case of district asylums the providing and maintaining of buildings, etc., does not fall on the poor rate, but is separately paid for out of the county and burgh assessments. The figures quoted by the memorialists as applicable to district asylums have reference merely to what is expended on the maintenance of patients as distinguished from outlay on land and buildings. In the case of Royal Asylums the rates charged to parishes are intended to cover both kinds of expenditure. In the case of District Asylums the burden of providing the land and buildings falls also on the public, though not paid out of the poor rate. The position of the matter may be conveniently illustrated by comparing what has taken place in the county of Perth with what has taken place in the neighbouring county of Forfar. There exists in the county of Perth, which constitutes the Perth Lunacy District, Murray's Royal Asylum, the Directors of which declined to avail themselves of their statutory power to compel the District Board to contract with them for the maintenance of their pauper lunatics, and resolved not to receive them. In consequence of this, the District Board were compelled to levy an assessment on the county for the erection of an asylum. The asylum was opened in 1864, and the cost of the land, the original buildings, the repairs, and other landlord expenses have been a burden, not on the payers of poor rates, but on the payers of county assessments ever since. The average assessment for these purposes for the 10 years ended 1888 was £3,190, and the average number of inmates in the asylum 270. There had been an annual burden on the payers of county and burgh assessments during these years on account of every pauper lunatic in the District Asylum of £11 16s. 3d. over and above the sums paid by the Parochial Boards out of the poor rates for the maintenance of lunatics. Although in time the original cost would be gradually paid off, it was found in the case of all asylums that from time to time alterations and additions had to be made which involved further borrowing, while the expense of repairs on the original building tended to increase from year to year. A fair estimate of what the permanent annual burden will probably be may be arrived at by taking six per cent. on the capital outlay for land and buildings to cover interest on capital and yearly charges for repairs, taxes, insurance, etc. The capital outlay in the case of Perth District Asylum was £40,000, which at six per cent. gives £2,400 per annum. This divided by 270 gives £8 18s. for each lunatic. The present annual payment for the maintenance of each lunatic made by Parochial Boards in the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.43.181.426-b Published online by Cambridge University Press

Perth district is £26, and this added to the contribution from the county makes the total annual cost of each lunatic £34 18s. If the position of Forfarshire, which constitutes the Forfar Lunacy District, be examined, it is found that the Royal Asylums of Dundee and Montrose have contracted to receive and maintain all pauper lunatics of the district, and that the rate charged at present is £28 12s. There has been no expenditure for the erection of a District Asylum, and that sum of £28 12s. per annum is the whole burden upon public funds for each pauper lunatic. Taking the whole of Scotland, it was found that there was an annual advantage of £3 11s. 9d. on account of each pauper lunatic belonging to the districts which were obliged to send them to Royal Asylums over those sent to District Asylums. It should be fully recognised that if the memorialists succeed in carrying out their views the result will be that the parochial rates would be saved an expenditure of £5 on each lunatic by laying on the county an assessment of £9 12s. 5d. for each lunatic. As to the second ground of complaint, Dr. Sibbald says that it is not the Parochial Boards, but the District Lunacy Boards, that are prevented from building new asylums or sending their patients to other asylums. Parochial Boards are equally obliged to send their pauper lunatics to the District Asylums of their Lunacy Districts with which the District Boards have entered into contracts. In the case of Royal Asylums, the rates are determined by negotiation between the asylums and the District Boards, and if the rate is regarded as excessive an appeal can be made to the General Board, which has power to settle the difference. In the case of District Asylums, the District Boards fix such a rate as will meet expenses. As to the third ground of complaint, Dr. Sibbald replies that in the seven Royal Asylums for 1889 the sum paid for pauper lunatics was considerably below the sum paidrfo private patients. As to the want of control on the part of Parochial Boards of the money expended on pauper lunatics, the memorandum states that that money, so far as the Parochial Board is concerned, is in the same position as the money collected for the school rate. Parochial Boards have no responsibility for the administration of the school rate, and they are just as free of responsibility in the management of asylums. An insuperable objection to giving representation of Parochial Boards on the governing bodies of asylums lies in the fact that such a representation would naturally lead to special advantages being given to Parochial Boards at the expense of private patients or to the detriment of other parts of the asylums. The manner in which the lunatics were provided for by Parochial Boards prior to 1857 required to be examined in order to obtain an idea of the evils which arose when two kinds of administration so different in their nature as the dealing with ordinary pauperism and the providing for the insane were associated under one authority. The state of matters then disclosed was universally admitted to be a disgrace to the country.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY ASYLUM.

An important addition to this Asylum was opened on the 24th February. By the Lunacy Act of 1890, powers were given to the Committee of Visitors to build for the reception of private patients, so as, in some measure, to counteract the evil done by limiting the licenses for private asylums. The Committee of Garlands Asylum have taken advantage of this enactment, and have erected a separate house about a quarter of a mile from the entrance door of the public asylum. It has the appearance of an elegant, commodious, and comfortable villa. The public rooms occupy the ground floor, and there are two four-bedded dormitories and four separate bedrooms on the first floor. The intention is to receive a limited number of male patients of quiet and orderly class in this house, and to add another similar building for female patients in due course. Dr. Campbell is to be congratulated upon having kept the Cumberland County Asylum well to the front in this matter. The wants of the insane

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.43.181.426-b Published online by Cambridge University Press