

utmost sympathy with the intention to minimise the use and to prevent the evils of this mode of treatment.

The Scottish Board of Lunacy defines restraint as follows:—“Whenever a patient is made to wear an article of dress or is placed in any apparatus which is fastened so as to prevent the patient from putting it off without assistance, and which restricts the movements of the patient or the use of hands or feet.” Their requirements with respect to restraint are that entries are to be made daily, to be signed by the medical officer who ordered the restraint, who must also give his reason for the order.

Mechanical means of restraint are defined by the English Commissioners as “all instruments and appliances whereby the movements of the body or of any of the limbs of a lunatic are restrained or impeded.”

The Irish Inspectors in this regulation, as in many others, faithfully copy the English Commissioners.

---

*The Evans Case.*

*Mechanical Restraint and Breach of the Lunacy Laws.*

At the Birmingham Quarter Sessions, on 11th October last, a medical man was fined £50 for having unlawfully taken charge of a lunatic in an uncertified house, etc. The defendant is reported to have stated that “he kept her in postural straps at intervals for a month, because during that time she scarcely once recovered sufficiently to be released.”

The Recorder, in passing judgment, remarked that he “was willing to believe that the defendant acted on an honest but ignorant belief, and would not therefore pass on him a sentence of imprisonment.”

This case, in which a doubtless well-intentioned medical man probably narrowly escaped a very serious position by the fact that the patient had been removed to an asylum twelve days before death, is a strong evidence of the necessity of continually insisting on the danger of this mode of treatment. The profession at large evidently needs continually to be reminded of views which, to alienists, have assumed the form of truisms.