The patient was treated with 150 grains of chloral, and one half-grain of morphia hypodermically, in addition to 20 minims and four ounces of whiskey, by the mouth, between 6.50 and 10.45 a.m. After the last dose, it is said, "within a few moments the patient fell into a quiet slumber," out of which he never came, dying at 9.40 p.m. There was no autopsy. The report says:—"The reply of another witness to the question, to which of these drugs, the morphia or the chloral, would you attribute the profound stupor of the patient? was quick and emphatic. 'I do not believe either had anything to do with it.' As to the propriety of the treatment adopted, the testimony was unanimous that it is abundantly justified by precedent, and by high medical authority, that the emergency was very great, and that no censure could attach to the adoption of heroic measures to save the life of the injured man." It concludes with the following remarks—

In the course of our inquiry, however, some other facts bearing upon the general management of the hospital came to our knowledge, to which we feel bound to allude.

The use of chloral-hydrate, to produce sleep at night, common, as we are informed, in the majority of hospitals, is carried to a considerable extent at Elgin. The night list of medicines administered, shows that about sixty patients, on an average, take chloral every night; the average dose being from thirty to thirty-five grains, in combination with whiskey, opium, or fluid extract of hyoscyamus.

Mechanical restraints are also employed, viz.:—The camisole, the muff, and the crib. The camisole is a stout jacket, with long sleeves, for confining the arms and hands; the muff is a leather contrivance for the same purpose; the crib is a strong bedstead, with mattress and bedding, the same as in other beds, and enclosed on the sides and top by a stout open cover to prevent the patient from sitting up or making his escape from the bed. The camisoles and muffs are kept in the wards; but the attendants have instructions not to use them without the physician's orders. No record, however, is kept of individual instances of restraint, an omission which we think it advisable to remedy in future. The crib-bedstead is in use only in exceptional cases and at night, unless in acute delirium, or other illness requiring its employment in the day time, which is of rare occurrence. The night-watch has instructions to visit patients sleeping in cribs, and see that they are cared for properly, and if soiling of the bed should occur, it is his duty to attend to the cleaning of the bed, and of the patient who occupies it.

None of these mechanical restraints are used for purposes of punishment or discipline, but simply to prevent patients from injuring themselves or others.

Attendants are not allowed to strike patients, except in self-defence, and to protect other patients from dangerous assaults. In the violent and excited wards this is sometimes necessary, and cannot be avoided. The fact that striking does occasionally occur was admitted by all the attendants, and justified, in case of necessity, both by them, and by the officers of the hospital. One attendant admitted that he had struck patients without reporting the fact to the Superintendent, as he is required to do by the bye-laws. We recommended his discharge, and also that of Mr. Crane. We understand that this has since been done.

As to the general efficiency, humanity, and success of the institution, nothing was developed by the testimony which would bring it into question.

THE LIABILITY OF A HUSBAND FOR DEBTS CONTRACTED BY HIS WIFE WHILE HE WAS INSANE.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE, NOVEMBER 23.

COURT OF APPEAL.

(*Sittings at Westminster, before Lords Justices* BRAMWELL, BRETT, *and* COTTON.)

SWIFT v. NUNN.

This action was against the same defendant as the case of "Drew v. Nunn," which came before the Court yesterday. It was an action by a butcher for the amount of his account for meat sold and delivered to the defendant's wife at the time when the defendant was in confinement as a lunatic. The defence was that the wife had no authority to pledge the husband's credit, and that she had a sufficient income during her husband's lunacy to prevent the necessity of

doing so. The answer to this allegation was that, though Mrs Nunn had an ample income for ordinary purposes, she had had various heavy expenses for the necessary purposes of setting her children out in the world, and, therefore, was under the necessity of pledging her husband's credit in various ways for the ordinary expenses of living. Mr. Nunn is a gentleman having landed property in Ireland to the value of something like £5,500 a year, the greater part of which was in the hands of his wife during his lunacy. Mr Nunn found means to escape from confinement, and cross to Ireland, where he has since been living. On his resuming the direction of his affairs he found that debts to the amount of about £2,700 had been incurred by his wife, which he objected to pay. At the trial it was shown that the manner in which the expenses of setting forward the children in life had been incurred was in obtaining for the eldest son the position of veterinary surgeon in a cavalry regiment (he had been accustomed to horses all his life, his father having kept a hunting and racing stud); for another son a situation in a coffee plantation in Ceylon, and for a daughter a situation as governess in Russia, and in sending another daughter to a convent in France. To these arrangements Mr. Nunn objected; and letters of a most disgraceful character written by him to his wife and the superior of the convent on the subject were put in at the trial. The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff, and the Common Pleas Division afterwards refused a rule for a new trial. On appeal, the Court of Appeal granted a rule returnable before themselves.

Mr. Murphy, Q.C., and Mr Turner now showed cause; Mr Day, Q.C., and Mr. Horne Payne supported the rule.

It was admitted that Lord Coleridge had left proper questions to the jury; but it was alleged that he had allowed the disgraceful letters of the defendant to have an undue weight with the jury, and that the verdict was against the weight of evidence.

Their LORDSHIPS discharged the rule,

Lord Justice BRAMWELL observing that he could not feel quite satisfied with the manner in which the case had been conducted, and that he feared the letters had been used for the purpose of prejudice. At the same time, he could see no such obvious and urgent reason for thinking there had been a failure of justice as to induce him to think that the discretion of Lord Coleridge, who was satisfied with the verdict, and of the Common Pleas Division should be set aside.

Lords Justices BRETT and COTTON concurred.—*Times.*

LORD JUSTICE BRAMWELL ON "UNCONTROLLABLE IMPULSE," AND ON ITS BEING "TOO SHOCKING AND CRUEL," AS WELL AS "IMPOSSIBLE," FOR AN EPILEPTIC MURDERER TO BE EXECUTED.

NOVEMBER 6.

(*Before Lord Justice* BRAMWELL.)

Thomas Humphreys was indicted for the wilful murder of his wife at Shrewsbury on the 30th of August last.

Mr. Boughey prosecuted; Mr C. J. Darling, at the request of the learned Judge, defended the prisoner.

The prisoner, a clothweaver by trade, had been married to his wife 20 years, and had always lived with her on affectionate terms. For 17 years he had been subject to epileptic fits, and 12 years since had attempted suicide. On the morning in question, groans having been heard in his house, the door was opened. and the bodies of the prisoner and his wife were found lying at the foot of the staircase, the wife dead, and the prisoner stabbed in a number of places. Upon being taken to the infirmary, he, later in the day, made a statement to