

no means object to this clause in the poor removal Act, and, indeed, we think it a just and good one, and one which, fairly carried into execution, will work well; but the tendency to work it, in the manner we have pointed out, will require to be carefully watched.

*Report of the Lunatic Asylum for Salop and Montgomery.*

Dr. Oliver mentions that in this asylum the power of the visitors to grant allowances to patients out on trial, under the seventy-ninth section of the Asylums Act, has been largely resorted to, and with the best effects. He says that 236 patients have at various times been sent out on trial, most of whom have been assisted by the allowance ordered by the visitors. In only forty-one of these cases has the experiment failed; by which we suppose Dr. Oliver to mean that in only this number of cases, patients, who have been sent out a month on trial, have not been able to remain out permanently. A difficulty has, however, unfortunately arisen which threatens to prevent the continuance of Dr. Oliver's practice of putting in force the powers of this seventy-ninth section. He says that the parish authorities have up to a late period made no objection to the payment of money for the relief of patients going out of the asylum on trial, but that recently they have asserted that no money can be legally advanced for this purpose beyond the first week's instalment, except an officer of the asylum shall assume the office of relieving officer, and pay the allowance to the patient or his friends every week during the period of the patient's experimental absence from the asylum, which is usually four weeks.

Dr. Oliver does not tell us whether, up to the present time, the parish authorities have themselves consented to be the medium through which the payment should be made, and that their objection would, therefore, mainly apply to the medium, and not to the period of the payment. We think they would be so far right, and that the proper person to make the payment is undoubtedly an officer of the asylum. But there is nothing in the act to say that the payment shall be made every week or every month. We remember an instance in our asylum, in which a recovered patient, who had got his livelihood by teaching, was maintained out of the asylum on trial for three months, during which he gathered pupils and self-confidence, and has supported himself ever since, whereas, if left without aid, he would probably by this time have become a chronic lunatic. In his case he appeared in person, and received his allowance once a month, and we have no doubt the visitors of an asylum have the full power to make an advance of this kind for a month, or for any other period which they may think right; the words of the act being, "It shall be lawful for such visitors to make such allowance to such last-mentioned person, not exceeding what would be the charge for such per-

son if in the asylum, which allowance, and no greater sum, shall be charged for him, and be payable as if he were actually in the asylum." There is nothing about paying the allowance every week here, and the only responsibility incurred by paying once a month would seem to be, that if the patient should spend the month's allowance during the first week, and become destitute, or if he should die, and his friends not refund the allowance, the union might decline to pay, and the asylum have to bear the loss. Of course the words quoted above, "shall be charged for him, and be payable as if he were actually in the asylum," mean that the sum shall be charged to the parish or union, and be payable by the parish or union to the treasurer of the asylum; and we can see no reason why the powers given by the act to enforce payment when it is refused, would not apply here as much as to the maintenance of the patient in the asylum, and therefore we cannot agree with Dr. Oliver in his opinion that the Lunacy Act gives no power to the visitors to enforce payment of this allowance.

This matter is important under other aspects than the one under which it is viewed by Dr. Oliver. In the Devon Asylum, for instance, a certain number of patients are always out on trial, living with cottagers in the neighbourhood, with a view of affording one means of relief to the over-crowded asylum. Some of these patients have been out on trial for several years, the asylum paying all charges, and in turn charging the parishes for their care and maintenance as if they were in the asylum. Now and then a parish has objected to the arrangement, and has requested that the patient may be sent home, and sometimes the visitors have acceded to the request, and sometimes have refused, being guided by the opinion they formed as to the probability of the patient being properly taken care of when at home. The payments for these patients are made monthly.

*Report of the Lancashire Asylum at Rainhill.*

The power of making the allowance to patients on trial appears also to have been freely used by the visitors of this asylum. Dr. Rogers says—"The clause in the Act of Parliament by which patients may be discharged on trial, and an allowance made to them during their period of probation, has been largely applied during the past year; and many have been thus discharged much earlier than it would have been thought prudent to do unconditionally. The period has, in one or two instances, been extended to a second month; and in two cases (both women), reports of their condition and conduct when at large not being satisfactory, their final discharge was withheld, and they still remain under treatment in the asylum."

It would appear, therefore, that in some asylums this allowance to patients on trial is freely granted, while in others benevolent funds have been established to effect the same end; thus in the next report which we take up, namely, that of—