moor on the reports of alienists. How is it that the judges and juries on these cases have overlooked the mental state, if these keen observers are more to be trusted than the alienist? and why is the alienist called in to rectify the injustice?

The writer again implies that "authors such as Dr. Clevenger" ignore the true object of legal punishment, which is the safety and security of society. This, however, is not in accordance with fact; the medical profession is constantly urging on the Legislature the means of protecting society from dangerous lunatics, unfortunately not with complete success. The medical profession, however, whilst thus desirous of protecting society, sees also the justice of protecting the individual against unguarded social instincts in the mass.

The legal profession, in its eagerness to secure the safety of society, tends to forget the rights of the individual. This is seen not only in the views that have been upheld in regard to the criminal insane, but still more markedly in the legal procedure interfering with the liberty of the sick insane in obtaining treatment.

We have no intention of here discussing the whole question of responsibility, but only desire to draw attention to one or two of the fallacies contained in this article, and to deprecate that kind of professional prejudice which is so great a bar to progress in the satisfactory solution of the important problem of criminal responsibility.

The Inoperative Inebriates Act.

The want of homes for the purposes of this Act was pointed out by us in our notes on this legislation last year. Unfortunately no one has been compelled to make such provision, and the Act practically remains a dead letter.

Magistrates have again and again desired to commit inebriates under the Act, but have been unable to do so. Three cases were remanded in one week at the North London Police Court only, so that the number requiring care must be very considerable.

The London County Council has had a special committee

meeting on the subject, but as yet nothing definite has been decided.

The onus of making the necessary provision of homes will almost inevitably fall on the County Councils, since the subsidy of ten shillings and sixpence per week provided from Government sources is apparently not enough to stimulate charitable effort in this direction.

Only three homes at present exist. The Victoria Home, near Bristol, accommodates about sixty persons, but when completed it will have room for several hundreds. The St. Joseph's Home at Ashford, Middlesex, is reserved for Roman Catholics only. The third is at Duxhurst, where Lady Henry Somerset has given up a small portion of her industrial homes: this, however, is not as yet available, the regulations of the Home Office not having been complied with. Practically, therefore, the provision is almost *nil*.

Considerable time must necessarily elapse before the County Councils, even at their most rapid rate of procedure, can organise homes, if, indeed, they undertake the duty, and do not leave to the Government the task of meeting the necessity arising from this legislation. Probably some of the Members of Parliament who were active in support of the new Act will not be content to let it remain a dead letter. Up to the present time, however, the London County Council has the credit of having at least considered what is best to be done, and we must patiently await the action that may result from that consideration.

The Brabazon Scheme in Asylums.

We publish in this number an account of the introduction for the first time of the Brabazon scheme into an asylum for the insane. For information upon the nature and aim of this enterprise we need only refer our readers to the article in question. Hitherto the scheme has been in working in workhouses and infirmaries only, but the Brabazon ladies are evidently prepared to carry their enterprise into the more difficult sphere of asylums. In order to attain the realisation of the conception from which this scheme originates, we require idle people,