to this or any other subject as a special one. It should be taken for granted that all such subjects came within the scope of the study of medicine, and the good sense and zeal of the examining bodies would lead them to put as much in the examinations as they safely could with reasonable justice to the students. Sir William Gull agreed. It was undesirable to split up the subject too much. Dr. Haughton said there were five medical authorities in Ireland, and not one of them required any training in a hospital for the insane. Mr. Macnamara said there would be great difficulties in some cases in obtaining facilities for the clinical study of mental diseases, and the Council ought to hesitate before making a recommendation which must afterwards be practically disregarded.

On being put to the vote, the motion was lost by 9 to 5.

At a meeting held July 6th, the subject was reconsidered. Dr. Banks moved, and Dr. Haughton seconded, the following resolution:—"That the subject of 'Mental Disease' be added to those of 'Hygiene' and 'Preventive Medicine' in the reference to the medical authorities." This reference was as follows:—"That considering how important it is to all medical practitioners to possess a competent knowledge of hygiene and preventive medicine, the Committee takes note of the suggestion of Dr. Gairdner and Mr. Stokes that these subjects ought to form a more independent part than they do of the examinations of all corporations," to be transmitted to all the medical authorities.

It will thus be seen that, although this does not amount to more than a recommendation of the Medical Council, there is considerable probability that it will pave the way to mental diseases becoming a subject of examination, and therefore taught more systematically and regularly in our schools of medicine.

LUNACY REGULATION AMENDMENT ACT.

In June the Lord Chancellor laid on the table of the House of Lords a Bill for amending the Lunacy Regulation Act. The object of this Bill was to facilitate the visitation of Chancery lunatics. It was read a second time July 10th. In the House of Commons it passed through Committee August 5th, and was read a third time on the 8th. Mr. Warton and Sir H. Holland complained that it proposed to reduce the number of visits to Chancery lunatics from four to two per annum. The former said it was a Bill got up to serve the selfish interests of the Lord Chancellor's visitors. Mr. Hibbert observed that the clauses in the Bill objected to only applied to patients in private houses. Dr. Farquharson said that frequent visits were only needed in the case of lunatics under the charge of attendants. Mr. Leighton and Mr. Whitley hoped there would be an increase in the number of visitors. A compromise was made, and it was agreed that the number of visits should be reduced to three instead of two. Mr. Scott thought it discreditable that the State should make a profit of £6,000 a year out of these lunacy patients.

The House of Lords amended the Commons' amendments, and the clauses of the Act as it received the Royal Assent, are as follows:—

Whereas it is expedient to amend the Lunacy Regulation Acts:

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited for all purposes as the Lunacy Regulation Amendment Act, 1882.

2. This Act shall be construed as one with the Lunacy Regulation Acts, 1853 (16 and 17 Vict., c. 70) and 1862 (25 and 26 Vict., c. 86), and unless there is something in the subject matter or context repugnant to such construction, the expression "The Lord Chancellor intrusted as aforesaid," and all other expressions having a special or defined meaning in the last-mentioned Acts, or either of them, shall have the same meaning in this Act.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.123.466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. Section twelve of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1862, is hereby amended so as to have effect as if the words "two thousand pounds in value" had been inserted therein instead of the words "one thousand pounds in value," and the words "one hundred pounds per annum" instead of "fifty pounds per annum."*

4. Whereas by section twenty of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1862, it is enacted that "every lunatic shall be personally visited and seen by one of the said visitors four times at least in every year, and such visits shall be so regulated as that the interval between successive visits to any such lunatic shall in no case exceed four months: Provided always, that lunatics who are resident in licensed houses, asylums, or registered hospitals shall not necessarily be visited by any of the said visitors more than once in the year, unless the Lord Chancellor intrusted as aforesaid shall otherwise direct;" Be it enacted, that the said section shall be construed as if the word "twice" had been inserted therein instead of the words "four times" and as if the words "eight months" had been inserted therein instead of the words "four months," and as if instead of the proviso therein there had been inserted the following words: Provided always, that every lunatic resident in a private house shall, during the two years next following inquisition, be so visited at least four times in every year.

FRENCH MADHOUSES AND THEIR VICTIMS.

Under this heading a sensational article appeared in the "Pall Mall Gazette," Aug. 19th, from the Paris correspondent. It has reference to Jean Mistral, who, for 42 years, has been confined in a private asylum at St. Rémy, in Provence. It is to be regretted that an article calculated to throw suspicion on all French asylums should be widely circulated without any pains being taken to ascertain the truth of the charge made against these institutions. The correspondent has taken his information solely from one source, M. Fournier. Now we have reason to believe that he is an unsafe authority to follow, that he is the cousin of the brother and guardian of M. Mistral, and that being on ill terms with him, he desires to injure him in all ways. He addressed to the Chamber of Deputies a petition in which the "facts" were presented, it is alleged, in a distorted manner. This petition was referred to the Minister of the Interior, who has ordered an inquiry to be made by three physicians, presided over by Dr. Cavelier, Professor of Mental Disorders at Montpellier. It should be stated that the Minister of the Interior has several times had occasion to examine into the affair, but has never found anything.

We cannot find any reference to the affair in any of the French medical papers; in fact, it does not appear to excite any interest in France.

The correspondent of the "Pall Mall" proceeds to give an account of the origin of the French law of 1838 relative to lunacy, and asserts that it was passed to enable the bourgeois King of the French (Louis Philippe) to "sleep quietly." This is so contrary to the actual history of this celebrated Act, that we are not disposed to attach credit to anything else the writer writes. As a matter of fact, it was prepared by M. Ferrus, and was carefully discussed by the two Chambers for two years. It is too bad of an English journal thus to misrepresent this remarkable piece of French lunacy legislation, and so to travesty history as to make the act appear to originate in a personal and pecuniary question. But then it is the vacation, and in the absence of parliamentary reports, the newspapers are thankful for startling statements which many will read but few will care to verify. So the "Pall Mall" vilifies the French asylums, and the "Standard" falls foul on those in England.

* Refers to the power of Lord Chancellor where property of lunatic does not exceed £2,000 or £100 per annum.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.28.123.466 Published online by Cambridge University Press