to an unprejudiced jury, would have been that this great and striking improvement showed how necessary to her welfare the mild restraint of the court must be. But apart from the damaging cross-examination of Drs. Brabazon, Knott, and Hatchell, which of itself was enough to carry conviction to the intelligence of the ordinary juror, counsel for the respondent did his utmost to impart a rancorous religious prejudice into the case, so that his client got with the utmost ease a verdict which will probably prove to be her destruction.

Court of Appeal.

(Before the Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Romer and Mathew.)

This appeal arose out of an action brought by a farmer's grazier named Pope, of Draughton, Northamptonshire, against several defendants for alleged conspiracy to place and keep him in the Berrywood Asylum as a lunatic whilst he was of sound mind. The defendants were John and Sidney Philip Pope, John Goodman (relieving officer for Brixworth), Dr. Wainwright (medical practitioner), Dr. William Harding (medical superintendent at the Berrywood Asylum), and May Pope (the plaintiff's wife). Plaintiff alleged against all the defendants other than Dr. Harding that they maliciously conspired to imprison him in the asylum; and further, he alleged against them all, including Dr. Harding, that they had conspired to detain him, after getting him in the asylum, from September 8th, 1899, to November 10th, 1899. The claim asked for £10,000 damages.

The present appeals were brought—first, by Dr. Wainwright, from a decision of Mr. Justice Bucknill in chambers refusing to stay all further proceedings in the action against him; and second, by the plaintiff, from a second order of the same judge staying all proceedings as against Dr. Harding.

Mr. Lush, K.C., on the first appeal, contended for the plaintiff that a *primâ facie* case had been made out that Dr. Wainwright had not acted *bonâ fide* and with reasonable care.

Lord Justice Romer: Do you really ask us to say that Dr. Wainwright did not really think the man insane?

Mr. Lush: I say there is *primâ facie* evidence to that effect.

Lord Justice Romer: Good gracious!

After further argument, and without calling on Mr. Tindal Atkinson, K.C., to reply,

The Master of the Rolls said plaintiff was unable to point to any technical flaw in the proceedings under the Lunacy Act. The plaintiff was undoubtedly committed to the asylum by a magistrate's order. Everything seemed to be in conformity with Section 16 of the Lunacy Act. There was no shadow of case of any misconduct, or malice, or want of reasonable care against Dr. Wainwright. The appeal would, therefore, be allowed, and action stayed as against that defendant, with costs.

The lords justices concurred, and the appeal was accordingly allowed.

Mr. Lush, K.C., did not proceed with the second appeal involving Dr. Harding, and that was dismissed with costs.

THE HUMOURS OF IRISH ASYLUM COMMITTEES.

Cork and Youghal.—We had occasion to draw attention in our last number to the angry passions which seem to be excited at the meetings of the Cork Asylum Committee when the question of the auxiliary asylum at Youghal comes up. The *Cork Examiner* of February 10th gives an account of a meeting of Committee held on the previous day at which there was the usual scene. On the question of how some obvious and perfectly trivial error crept into certain documents, charges of "cooking" the minutes were repeated and charges of "evading the minutes" added. A fiery discussion, occupying almost three columns of the newspaper, ended (for the time at least) in a general retreat on the part of everybody. Apparently it was found impossible to fix any definite blame upon the medical superintendent. By as much as that gentleman is discredited, and by as much as his staff are encouraged to oppose him, by so much is the danger of his venturing to criticise the auxiliary arrangements diminished.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.50.209.355 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Buttons!—Wasn't it Mrs. Gamp who complained of the "imperence of them boys in buttons?" A similar sentiment appears to rankle in the mind of a certain member of the Cork Asylum Committee who, coming to the usual monthly meeting in March, was struck all in a heap by finding that the gate was opened by a myrmidon who bore on his cap a button with the royal crown emblazoned upon it. Restraining his natural indignation till he reached the committee room he there opened his heart to his colleagues. With unanimity and a vigour calculated to make all the monarchs of Europe shake it was resolved that crowns were to be no more. Whether buttons were to follow does not appear quite clearly, but judging by the costumes in which Mr. Benson's company act Irish plays, in which buttons were conspicuously absent, we apprehend that the employées of the Cork Asylum will in future hold themselves together with early Irish safety pins, constructed, as we understand antiquarians believe, from the *aculei* of *Crataegus Oxycantha*. Be that as it may, one member, filled with the fire of poetry and the spirit of prophecy, said, "The crown will soon be a faded flower." We have heard that the greasing of the sepoy's cartridges was the cause of the Indian Mutiny. Perchance with them and Marie Antoniette's diamond necklace the buttons of the Cork Asylum will figure as the little things that gave rise to a great revolution!

Argumentum baculinum.—The following paragraph appeared in the Dublin *Evening Herald* of March 12th:—

"MR. JOHN O'DONNELL, M.P., seriously assaulted at Castlebar.—The election of a temporary assistant storekeeper to Mayo Asylum took place at a meeting of the Asylum Committee at Castlebar to-day. Amongst the candidates were James Daly, jun., and Wm. Cunnane, formerly League Organiser. Cunnane was elected by a majority of one vote, amongst those voting for him being Mr. John O'Donnell, M.P., who, it is understood, travelled over specially from London to support Cunnane. After the election Mr. O'Donnell, accompanied by Messrs. Heraghty and Brett, were leaving the asylum, when O'Donnell was attacked with a stick by a man whose name is alleged to be Michael Neary, and received a severe wound over two inches long on the side of the head. Mr. O'Donnell, who was bleeding freely, was removed to the porter's lodge, where the wound was dressed by Doctors Hopkins and Ellison. The police visited the scene immediately, and O'Donnell has signified his intention of making an information."

Another Dublin evening paper of the same date gives an account identical with the above, save that it contains a small additional matter which we think it would be wrong to keep from our readers. The *Evening Mail* inserts after the word "organiser" these words, "The candidates were submitted to a test in writing and arithmetic. The election was then proceeded with." It is pleasant to think that being a "League organiser" is not absolutely the only qualification required in Mayo for being an assistant storekeeper. The possibility of holding a test examination in writing and arithmetic at the meeting of an asylum committee (though it calls up quaint images to the dull Saxon mind) is also a charming proof of the accomplishments and versatility of the Castlebar Committee. The precise necessity for the bacillary appeal after the examination we cannot understand, perhaps because we lack the agile Keltic imagination. It is true we have known the stick applied after tests in writing and elementary arithmetic, but, alas! not to the examiner, nor usually to the *head*. In the far-off days when we were young and when we were accustomed to associate sticks with examinations, the application was generally fundamental and intended no doubt to reach the head indirectly by *contre-coup*. There is only one solution for this knotty question which the most profound cogitation is able to suggest. Can Mr. John O'Donnell, M.P., be the same stalwart gentleman who addressed the House of Commons in Irish, and can he have so far relinquished his principles as to come all the way from London for the purpose of examining a candidate for the post of assistant storekeeper in the Mayo Asylum in the writing and the arithmetic of the English tyrant? It is not specified that the examination in either of these branches of learning was conducted in Gaelic, so we fear that the latter portion of this question must be answered in the affirmative. This may well account for the wrath of the "alleged" Michael Neary. For why should the King's writing and arithmetic run in Connaught when the King's crown is kicked out of Munster?

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.50.209.355 Published online by Cambridge University Press