

Bench thought in arriving at the conclusion they did that that ought not to be.—Mr. Parsons said that as regarded the expense the Magistrates knew too well the great cost which had to be incurred at the present time in sending cases to all parts of England, and of course if the proceedings passed through the hands of the Court certain fees which would be incurred would increase the present great cost.—The Chairman said he should not take a lunacy case without the Clerk.—Mr. Parsons asked if the Magistrates would consider the matter again?—Mr. Flowers said Mr. Parsons, from what he had heard, could gauge the feelings of the Magistrates, whereupon Mr. Parsons withdrew.”

It will be noticed that the protest against increased expense being incurred in the proceedings before justices in connection with lunacy cases comes from a Board of Guardians, but presumably the Sussex justices intend their decision as to the attendance of the Clerk to apply to private cases as well as pauper, and thus organised delay and expense will be put in the way of petitioners applying for reception orders. We cannot think that it was ever intended that the Lunacy Act of 1890 should be interpreted thus, though possibly the action of the justices may be within the wording of the Act. It would be desirable to have an explanation from someone with authority to give it as to what is meant by sec. 4, sub-sec. 2, which states, “The order shall be obtained upon a *private* application,” etc. Sec. 6, sub-sec. 3, further states: “The petition shall be considered in *private*.”

We are afraid, however, that the justices can take refuge behind sec. 9, sub-sec. 2, which enacts that the judicial authority “shall be assisted, if he so requires, by the same officers” as if he were acting in the exercise of his ordinary jurisdiction, and that no protest, therefore, is of any use. That there is a tendency in some justices to inflict unnecessary expense on the relatives of a patient may be illustrated by a recent case, in which, although the justice was satisfied with the *bona-fides* of the certifying medical man, and although he saw the patient and observed that she was acting unreasonably, yet he refused to make a reception order until his own medical man was called in, who signed a third certificate, for which the relatives of the patient paid a fee of one guinea.

PENSION SCHEME OF THE LANCASHIRE ASYLUM BOARD.

A Committee of this Board, appointed to consider the pension question, has drawn up a report, which has recently been adopted at a general meeting of the Board.

The age limit of fifty-five is adopted, but pensions at an earlier age may be given under special circumstances, and the rule of compulsory resignation at sixty is similarly elastic.

The scale of pension may be varied from one-third of the salary alone to the full two-thirds of the salary and emoluments, the actual pension within these limits being left to the recommendation of the Asylum Committee concerned.

If this scheme is applied in a liberal spirit it will be hailed with satisfaction, but some experience of its working will be required before expressing any strong opinion in regard to it.

It is certainly an improvement on the no pension scheme, with which Lancashire was threatened.

CORRESPONDENCE.

From Dr. Jules Morel, Ghent.

In reference to the discussion on “Forcible Feeding,” published in the *Journal of Mental Science* in October, I desire to communicate the method which I have used here for many years.

Having exhausted all means of persuasion, I make a signal to the attendants, who are trained to place the patient in bed in a horizontal position. One holds the knees firmly to the mattress, another, standing at the top of the bedstead, fixes the head between his hands. A third and fourth attendant, stationed on each side, hold the shoulders and forearms. The patient having been thus dealt with, without a word passing, the physician pours the liquid food at 98° Fahr. down either nostril, little by little, by means of a small spoon.