
Notes and Selections.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION — DEFECTIVE SIDEWALK — INJURY TO CHILD PLAYING ON STREET.—The Supreme Court of Wisconsin, in *Reed v. City of Madison*, 53 N.W. Rep. 547, hold that the right of action against a city for injuries caused by a defective sidewalk is purely statutory, and is available only when the person injured was at the time using the sidewalk or highway for purposes of travel. In this case the plaintiff was rolling her hoop and running slowly along the sidewalk on the way to play with other children a short distance off, when she tripped on a defective board and the hoop stick penetrated her eye. It was held that the fact that she was using the sidewalk for play as well as travel did not prevent recovery.—*Central Law Journal*.

HYPNOTISM.—We believe that the committee of the British Medical Association, which has for some time been investigating the therapeutic value and the medico-legal aspects of hypnotism, adhering to the *interim* report which it presented to the association at their last meeting, will this year again recommend the legislative restriction of hypnotic entertainments. The view of the committee is that the right to hypnotize should be confined by Act of Parliament to registered medical practitioners and other licensed persons. The *raison d'être* of the proposed extension of this privilege beyond the strict limits of the medical profession is, of course, to avoid debarring the eminent British and foreign scientists who have done so much for "the new mesmerism," but who have no medical qualification, from the practice of hypnotic suggestion. It is, we understand, almost certain that the forthcoming report of the Committee on Hypnosis will this year be adopted and approved by the British Medical Association. In addition to the question of its statutory regulation, the science of hypnotism gives rise to a number of difficult medico-legal problems. Can persons under the influence of hypnosis be induced to commit criminal acts; and, if so, what is the measure of their responsibility? Is it legitimate to hypnotize for the purpose of obtaining evidence; and what is the value of testimony so obtained? The whole subject is one of intense and immediate interest.—*Law Journal*.