

tions of the staff. The latter at the present time probably make an outlay which would more than cover this co-ordinated expenditure.

The library funds would by such an arrangement be set free to obtain by purchase all really important books as well as to make such a subscription to Lewis's as would make the more ephemeral and doubtful books available to members in every part of the country.

The scientific spirit of the Association would be greatly encouraged by such an arrangement, and in the course of time, by gifts and bequests, in addition to the sources of acquisition above indicated, the Association would become the possessor of a library *nulli secundus* in its special subjects, in which its members might have a justifiable pride.

Forcible Feeding.

The long and acrimonious discussion in the *Times* on the question whether Sir Victor Horsley introduced the suggestion of an alternative to nasal feeding in the trial relating to the forcible feeding of a female prisoner, is of little interest to the readers of this Journal.

Sir Victor's description of nasal feeding as "disgusting," "barbarous," and "brutal," in so public a manner, certainly calls for comment. In asylums this procedure is daily necessitated, and it is desirable that our patients and their friends should not be encouraged to view this method of treatment in this light, since many of them would be seriously prejudiced thereby. "Disgusting," if applied to the quality of the food, is certainly erroneous, since this is commonly of the very best kind. "Brutal," if it refers to the mode of feeding or the intentions of the feeders, is also unwarranted in regard to a procedure that is only resorted to in the best interests of the patient. "Barbarous" is certainly not a true description of a mode of treatment employed in the most modern hospitals. Sir Victor Horsley admitted that he had used it, and would use it if necessary. Is he therefore barbarous?

These epithets are certainly not merited by nasal feeding as practised in our hospitals and asylums, and were intended, we must assume, to apply to the circumstances of the particular case. It is desirable that this should be made perfectly clear.

The feeding of a starving person, whether insane or suffering from temporary aberration, due to emotional debauchery in political excitement, is certainly legitimate medical treatment; the method is warranted by scientific knowledge, and the intention of its use has the sanction of the highest benevolence, which cannot be affected by any circumstances of a political character.

Part II.—Reviews and Notices.

The Sixty-Third Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 1909.

The Report opens with a succinct summary of the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded (1908), on which numerous remarks and suggestions are made.

The suggestion is made that provisions similar to those contained in Sections 14, 16, and 18 of the Lunacy Act of 1890 will need to be retained to prevent "an unnecessary increase in the number of cases requiring the order of a judicial authority to be made on petition supported by two medical certificates."

The Commissioners express their concurrence in regard to the examination into the mental condition of persons in whom, whether convicted or acquitted, any question of mental defect may be raised.

If the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice becomes the authority relating to the management and administration of mental defectives, the Commissioners express the hope that some attempt should be made to cheapen the procedure.

The amalgamation of the Chancery Masters with the Lunacy Commissioners is also supported, and it is urged that the recommendation for the immediate appointment of two additional medical commissioners should be carried out. The necessity that the Commission should be predominantly medical is insisted on.

The suggestions for increased facilities for the treatment of incipient and unconfirmed insanity and for the advance of scientific investigation are also warmly supported.

The Commissioners state that the recommendation that an architect should be appointed in connection with the Lunacy Board has been already carried out. This would seem to indicate that the treatment by bricks and mortar still takes precedence to that by medical science in the opinion of the Treasury. The delay in appointing the additional medical commissioners is a scandal, which should overwhelm with confusion and shame any representative body that possessed the faintest perception of responsibility or the least glimmering of a moral conscience.

The Commissioners also recommend that the "present disqualifi-