Journal of Social Science, containing the Transactions of the American Association, No. xxix., August, 1892.

This number contains a sketch of the life of Dr. Pliny Earle, by Mr. Sombourn. It is, as might be expected, an appreciative contribution, but in no degree in excess of the simple truth.

Dr. Earle never fell into that convenient error of his associates, which led them to maintain that insane persons can be cared for properly in huge caravansaries, where all individuality is lost, and where medical skill and moral treatment become equally unavailing, since they are neutralized by the unfavourable inferences, material, mental and spiritual, which inevitably occur in those great aggregations of morbid humanity, subjected to mechanical management, and deprived of those natural conditions of human society which have so much to do with the restoration of alienated minds. . . . On the contrary, he advocated small asylums and individual care, and, although he came slowly to this last opinion, the reception of the chronic insane into private asylums, instead of sending them to the almshouses or the asylum prisons. No one will now question that Dr. Earle had mastered the literature of insanity more completely than any American who has written on that subject. He began his researches before he graduated, and he continued them almost to the day of his death. His last contribution to this literature was an article on "Curability of the Insane," furnished by him in 1891 to Dr. Tuke's "Dictionary of Psychological Medicine," of which he showed me the proof sheets when I last visited him in March, 1892. He had made arrangements for the publication by his executors of some portion of his writings, and it cannot be doubted that these will be an important part of what America has contributed to a knowledge of insanity. . . . He followed humbly and sacredly the *Inner Light*, with very little desire to set up his own enlightenment as the limit for all other persons. Few persons of my acquaintance leave more enviable reputation.

PART IV.—NOTES AND NEWS.

MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

A meeting of the Association, being an adjournment of the Annual Meeting, held at Buxton, was held on Thursday, November 16th, at 10.0 a.m., at the Rooms, 11, Chandos Street, Cavendish Square, W., under the presidency of James Murray Lindsay, M.D.

The PRESIDENT said that the meeting that morning was held for the express purpose of considering the report of the Rules Committee.

Dr. RAYNER said there had been one proposition mooted since the annual meeting, which did affect a considerable number of the rules, and he thought it would save time if that proposition were at once dealt with, and either accepted or rejected, so that the passing of the rules might be facilitated. The suggestion he had in mind was the formation of divisions or branches. The idea was not his, but he endorsed it fully, and he thought it would conduce very greatly to the welfare and strengthening of the Association. The principle was not a new one, for they had already local divisions for Scotland and for Ireland, and they knew how well they worked, how thoroughly they stirred up the interest of the members of those divisions in the Association, and what a large proportion of men occupied in their profession were members in those divisions as compared with England. He felt sure that if they had a further division in England it would have the same effect as it had in Scotland and in Ireland. He would leave Dr. Macdonald to go into the details of the proposition, because he

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had really worked out the scheme. He thought it right to say that he felt sure Dr. Macdonald and all those interested with him in the matter regretted extremely that the idea had not occurred to them earlier, so that the suggestion could have been made to the Rules Committee before the revision had gone so far, because he felt sure that the rules had been most admirably revised, and with the greatest care and consideration. It was such a very great addition to the usefulness of the Association that he felt sure that the committee would not mind further trouble, supposing the resolution were adopted, having already given their services so willingly and ungrudgingly. He had great pleasure in moving—"That for the better working of the Association local divisions be formed, and that the Committee on the Rules be asked to amend their proposed rules, so as to carry this into effect."

Dr. MACDONALD said that he had great pleasure in seconding the resolution, which had been proposed in such kind terms by Dr. Rayner. He was sorry in asking the members to consider the question of "divisions" to think that so much confusion had been created. He was not proposing to introduce anything new; it was simply a rearrangement of their work. There were already in existence a Scotch and an Irish Division, and it was well known what good work they had done, and were doing. It might be said with regard to the proposal that there should be two divisions for England, that they already had a division, but his argument was that England was too large an area to cover, and it was not possible to fix meeting places at centres which would be convenient to more than a third of the members. Even if they did attend, it meant a great inconvenience, sacrifice of time, and great expense—he was not referring to annual meetings, that was a totally different thing. He thought if the divisions were formed many members, who had not at present joined, would be induced to attend, and, above all, that large body of members, the assistant medical officers, would have an opportunity of attending meetings and making contributions, which opportunity was not now given to them, because of the inaccessibility of the meeting places. He did not think there could be much difference of opinion with regard to that. It was proposed also that each division should nominate an Honorary Divisional Secretary, who would be in touch with the members. It was quite impossible for Dr. Beach, at the present moment, to be in touch with all the members. If the Council allowed £300 or £400 a year as travelling expenses, so that Dr. Beach could go all over the country, he thought then that he (the Secretary) would have an opportunity of knowing the members, but at the present time there was very little chance of that. The Divisional Secretaries would be able to stimulate the young members to work for the good of the Association, and fresh life would be thrown into it in many ways. It might be urged that there were not sufficient members to have these divisional meetings, but if a handful of members, such as they had in Scotland and Ireland, could hold good meetings, and could be productive of real, grand, scientific work, was it to be said that the English members, who were three or four times their number, could not have more than one meeting in three months? He would like to suggest one division of England, which he had in his mind, namely, a line from the Wash to the Bristol Channel, which would skirt the north of Northamptonshire. North of that division there were over 120 members connected with public asylums, and south of the division there were over 150. Surely the members in those divisions would not say that they could not have successful meetings after seeing what was done in Scotland and in Ireland. Apathy and indifference might be an excuse, but insufficiency of members, certainly, could not be urged. It had also been urged that the formation of these divisions would mean splitting up the Association. His idea, and the idea of many of their distinguished members, was that the present system was splitting up the Association, and that their suggestion was simply an endeavour to bring the members more in touch with each other, and to cement them better together. The more they met in different parts of the country the better known the Association would be, and the greater would be its power.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

He was desirous, as far as possible, of steering clear of all dangerous ground, but it was no secret that there had been discontent. He thought it was pretty generally admitted that there was not that satisfaction and contentment reigning in the Association which they desired should reign, and he felt sure this idea of rearranging the work would do a great deal of good, and do away with much of that discontent. Many more members would be enabled to attend, and he was quite sure that it would be one of the most healthy things which had been introduced into the organization for a long time. He wished the line of division he had mentioned to be taken as a suggestion. He thought that the members would be surprised to hear that there were about 260 assistant medical officers in the three parts of the kingdom, and only about 92 were members of the Association. He thought that they should try and get more members from that large body from whom they might expect so much, and the idea which he proposed, he considered would go a long way towards that. He understood that if the proposal were carried notice would be sent to every member the same as at present, so that those members on the border line would have the opportunity of attending meetings in the north and in the south as well; the meetings would be open to everybody just as at present, only the places acceptable to a large number would be greatly increased.

Dr. NEWINGTON said the proposals contained in the paper which had been circulated would strike the members as an exceedingly broad one, for it contained three separate propositions, each one of which required to be separately discussed. The first one was that there should be branches formed for local business. There could be no objection to that if by local business they meant the reading of papers, the election of members, and the ordinary duties such as were now carried on in Ireland and Scotland, and he thought everybody would back up the proposition. He also thought that there could be no opposition to the branches having the power of electing an Honorary Secretary, who should be *ipso facto* an *ex-officio* member of the Council. He should wish to say plainly that there had been no organization with regard to these proposals on the part of the Rules Committee. Most of them thought that the Rules Committee died at Buxton, and therefore they did not meet to consider the propositions, but a few minutes before that meeting took place a few of the members talked the proposals over purely out of courtesy to the Association, which had honoured them by its instructions to consider the rules. With that exception they had had no organization; they had no whips, no circulars, nor editorials to help them; each one was going to act on his own views with regard to the new propositions, although the meeting would not be surprised that there would be a little hanging together on the part of the committee with regard to other more or less important matters. The second idea was that each Division should nominate an Honorary Divisional Secretary, and, as he said before, he thought there could be no objection to that. The third idea was a far more important one, and was to the effect that each Division should have the power of electing its direct representative to serve on the Council. He confessed that he had a perfectly open mind on that point, but he should want to hear something more than he had at present heard to induce him to vote for such a proposition. In reference to the propositions he had heard the word "reform" used, but they maintained on the Committee that they had carried out reforms to the greatest possible extent, and had even gone beyond the bounds of Parliamentary reform. In Parliamentary voting everybody had to attend at the polls to record his vote, but in their suggestions the member had an opportunity of smoking his pipe by the fire and at the same time recording his vote. He had simply to send his paper up to the Council and his vote would be recorded. He did not see the necessity for a sub-division of the voting power. Everybody had a vote, and he thought it would be for the interests of the Association if the votes were given and collected as a whole rather than in divisions. Under the arrangements proposed they might get a very fairly balanced Council on paper, but the balance would be upset by the way in which the officers were elected. Then serious

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

questions would arise as to whether the officers were to come from one part of the kingdom or from another part, and whether they were to represent county asylums, hospitals, private asylums, or unattached members of the Association. If the idea was carried he foresaw a split up of what might be now considered a perfect form of voting. It would cause a very great deal of friction, and would imperil the best interests of the Association. There was another matter which he thought ought to have been more fully dealt with by the gentlemen who brought forward the resolution. He believed that it was a cardinal point in all kinds of reform that where there was any alteration in the nature of the representation of a constituency of a kingdom there should be a proper distribution of seats. The proposition suggested that one-third of the Council—six out of eighteen—should be allocated to Scotland and Ireland, and one-third to the South and one-third to the North of England. He found that there were 470 members. The odd 70 were foreign, colonial, corresponding, and honorary members, none of whom could take part in the management of the affairs of the Association, so that there were exactly 400 members left to deal with. Out of the 400 there were 48 residing in Scotland and 44 in Ireland, or nearly a quarter of the 400, so that the proposition meant that one-quarter of the Association should have one-third of the voting power. He thought that could not be just, and the injustice—he used the word quite inoffensively—was much exaggerated when they came to England. Dr. Macdonald had suggested one line of division, and he (Dr. Newington) proposed to give another which he thought they would agree was a very fair one. He proposed to divide England into north and south divisions in the following ways—a line bounding the north division on its southern aspect, moving from east to west, would be Norfolk, Rutland, Leicester, Stafford, and Salop; the northern line of the south division would be Suffolk, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Warwick, Worcester, and Hereford. Taking that line, it would be found that in the whole of England there were roughly 308 members, in the north 98, and in the south 210; so that they were proposing that the 98 gentlemen in the north should have the same elective power as the 210 in the south. That could not be right. To put it another way, it would be seen that the gentlemen south of the line had a clear majority in the Association, but yet the proposition really meant that one man in the north would have the same powers as two men in the south. For those reasons he entirely objected to that part of the proposition. To sum up his position, he said that he would gladly go with the other members in forming branches for the reading of papers and other such business, but he did not see the utility of giving those branches power to elect representatives on the Council. He thought there would be a great difficulty when they came to the subdivision.

Dr. MERCIER said that if it was found that the propositions were for the benefit of the Association he felt sure that they would all be delighted to adopt them, but it was necessary that they should see clearly what they were doing before they undertook a too far-reaching reform which would overrule the constitution of the Society. Up to the present he did not see that any cogent reasons had been given to induce the members to adopt the propositions, although his mind was perfectly open on the matter. With regard to the voting power, he thought that it was a matter which did not necessarily go with the question of formation of branches, although it was put down on the same paper. He would like to point out the difference between the method of voting now proposed and the method of voting proposed by the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee proposed that every member of the Association should have a vote, and a vote which could not be taken from him by reason of travelling and expense, because he could send his vote up to the Association to be recorded. Under the proposed system of voting that power would be taken from him, because voting would be restricted to the members residing in the district. For his part he would strongly object to have his vote restricted in that way. The committee claimed that they had spent a great deal of time in the revision of the rules, and he trusted that they would have a fair consideration at their

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hands, and any proposals which the Association might think fit to adopt they would be only too pleased to embody.

Dr. TURNBULL said that he could not agree with Dr. Mercier that cogent reasons had not been put forward for the propositions. He thought everybody knew the great difficulties there were in the way of members attending their meetings, and it could not be expected that members should come all the way from the north of England to London both to the Quarterly Meeting and Annual Meeting, so that it would be for the convenience of the members to have the meetings differently arranged. Under the present propositions the member was asked to attend the same number of meetings as formerly, the only differences being that the meetings were held nearer his home, and he had the advantage of attending other meetings if he liked. The experience of other Associations was that a division of that kind would promote the work of the Association and increase its membership; and it was certainly too much to expect the General Secretary, who had all the work of the Association to attend to, to keep in touch with the men who were living in the distant parts of England. The scheme was really a development on the lines upon which the Association had already gone. When the Association was first formed there was only one meeting—the Annual Meeting—but when it grew in numbers and vigour arrangements were made for holding other meetings, and it was at once felt that members from different parts of the kingdom could not attend the meetings if they were always fixed in one district. Consequently it was arranged that two of the meetings should be held in London, or in England at any rate, two of them in Scotland, and one or more in Ireland, as might be desirable, and there was also a distinct understanding that notice of all these meetings should be sent to every member of the Association. Dr. Newington had discussed another question, that of local representation, but they were quite willing to meet any arrangement that might be thought desirable; the only thing they wished to do was to establish the principle. He thought that the question of local representation was not before the meeting at that moment, and he would leave his remarks on that subject until later.

Dr. STANLEY GILL said that the propositions savoured very much of Home Rule, and he was inclined to think that the formation of branches would lead to the disruption of the Society altogether, because the number of members was not sufficiently large to permit of it. He certainly should vote against the proposition.

Dr. ELKINS said that, speaking as an Assistant Medical Officer, he could not help saying that he was in favour of the propositions that had been brought forward. He certainly thought that it would enable assistants to attend the Quarterly Meetings in the various districts, and to take more interest in the work of the Association generally. The future success and prosperity of the Association depended on the joining of the younger men, and if the branches were formed he felt sure that Assistants would come forward more than they were enabled to do at present. He thought it was quite right that every branch should send its representative to the Council. He could not see how the proposals were revolutionary. They seemed to him to be on the ordinary lines of development of any Society, and not in any way opposed to the Association. There was plenty of proof of the result of the formation of the branches in Scotland and in Ireland. It was quite impossible for the majority of Assistants to attend the meetings unless they lived round London, Edinburgh, or Dublin. He felt sure that everyone would agree that the remote districts should have more representatives than the districts nearer home. He thought that there was a legitimate ground for discontent, because in many parts of England and the North they were out of touch with the Association altogether, and if the members could not come to the Association it was their duty to go to them. He heartily supported the propositions.

Dr. HACK TUKE said that when he first read the propositions which had been brought forward he felt considerable hesitation in regard to them. He sup-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

posed that one became more conservative as one got older, and in regard to some of the propositions he did feel considerable doubt as to their working power, but the more he considered them as a whole the more he felt disposed to look favourably upon them. As regarded the general principle he was quite prepared to support it. He felt that there had been very considerable apathy with regard to the members of the Association and those engaged in lunacy work who were outside the Association. He was glad to see any indication whatever of fresh life, and he looked upon the present movement, speaking quite generally, as an encouraging sign of an increased interest being taken in the Association. He quite agreed with the first proposition, and he thought that the two divisions suggested were the best, although that was a point of detail. With regard to the appointment of an Honorary Divisional Secretary he thought it should be borne in mind that although the General Secretary's work was to be lightened his supreme power as a Secretary was not in any way to be imperilled, and that ought certainly to be held in view. He did, however, object to the electing of the representative on the General Council, and on that point he quite agreed with Dr. Newington. With the permission of the President he would read a portion of a letter from Dr. Howden, in which he said he thought that the modified form of Home Rule now asked for should be granted. He (Dr. Tuke) was reminded of what the old Lord Holland had advised when a new departure was proposed in politics. He said: "*Fiat experimentum in corpore vili.* Let the experiment be first tried on Scotland." (Laughter.) Well, it had been tried in that country, and had answered. He was, therefore, encouraged to extend the principle to England.

Dr. DRAS said that as a member from a rather remote portion of England he wished to express his concurrence with the general principles of the change. He was glad that so cautious a man as Dr. Hack Tuke saw his way to accept the principle of the proposition. He felt sure that from his long and intimate connection with the Association he would be the last man to lend himself to anything that savoured of a revolutionary change in the constitution of the Association. Speaking for himself he did not see anything revolutionary in the change. The divisions in Scotland and Ireland showed that the change was justifiable, and it was only justice for England that it should be carried out. They all recognized with the utmost satisfaction the progress which the Association had made. It had done a great deal of good in promoting everything connected with psychological medicine, but there was something which had not been quite met by the existing arrangements of the Association, and the time had come when it was necessary for them to consider whether there was not a block put on the Association in connection with the inducements afforded to men living in the country districts to promote the objects of the Association, and in connection with encouraging men in local centres to meet and talk over matters which affected them individually or the district in which they lived, and which could not be dealt with at the ordinary meetings of the Association. There were differences of opinion in different parts of the country as to the forms and causes of insanity and with regard to the working and organization of asylums. A great field was open in that direction, and the proposed division would immensely facilitate the work. He lived in a somewhat remote part of England, and from that and other circumstances he had been unable to keep in touch with the Association and to attend the meetings without trenching on his work, but if a Southern division were formed, and that division had an opportunity of arranging local meetings, he would have more opportunity of taking part in the Association. He had looked through the Journal for the last four years, and he found that there had been eight quarterly meetings held in London, three in the rest of England, five in Scotland, and at least two in Ireland. He thought it was a great argument in favour of the proposed division that Scotland had held five meetings, while only eight were held in London and three in the rest of England. He had great pleasure in supporting the proposition which had been made.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mr RICHARDS said that the point that ought to be discussed was by what arrangement they could get the greatest scientific outcome from the Association. At the present time they only met four times a year, and there were only about five or six papers read and discussed. He thought that was a very good argument in favour of the proposed division. He would even go farther, and divide England up into three or four divisions. He thought that if they did not concede this division the members in the North would before long take the matter into their own hands, and that might cause a split in the Association.

Dr. NICOLSON said that he thought they were wasting time with regard to that portion of the proposal, because they were practically unanimous that it was a desirable movement. He was glad to hear that Dr. Tuke, who was so familiar with the working of the Association, and who was, therefore, in a position to judge, had spoken in favour of the proposal. He most cordially supported the proposition.

Dr. ERNEST WHITE said that he believed the meeting would prove practically unanimous in favour of the formation of divisions or branches. Some two years ago he had proposed to the Council, and was then ably seconded by Dr. Wiglesworth, whom he regretted not to see present, "That Colonial Branches should be formed for the election of members and discussion of papers upon scientific subjects relating to insanity, and should be constituted upon similar lines to the Colonial Branches of the British Medical Association." This proposal was the outcome of an application from Dr. Greenlees, his former Assistant, now superintendent at the Grahamstown Asylum, for permission to start a branch for the Cape Colony. He was uncertain what action was taken in this matter at the annual meeting which followed, and which, unfortunately, he could not attend. Speaking as a member of the Rules Committee, he would urge the meeting that before the principle of divisions or branches is accepted and adopted it should be made quite clear that these branches should only have power to discuss scientific matters and matters of local interest in addition to the electing of members, and not in any way be able to infringe the prerogatives of the Council and central body of the Association, that is, they should have neither general administrative power nor any control of finance. If that were done he thought there would be no difficulty in their agreeing to the proposition. He presumed that the motion was a general one, viz., that branches be formed, and that it did not state that there were to be two divisions for England and one each for Scotland and Ireland, for that would not be proportionate representation.

The PRESIDENT said that the motion was a general one, and simply stated that branches should be formed.

Dr. NEWINGTON asked to be allowed to put himself straight with the meeting. He had understood that Dr. Rayner had invited the meeting to decide for the sake of convenience on new and general propositions that were outside the rules as revised by the Committee. He quite understood that Dr. Rayner's proposition was intended to raise all the questions which had been associated with the general proposition of branches.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said he thought the objects which they all had in view could be attained just as easily by an increased number of meetings of the Association generally as by the proposed divisions, especially if the meetings were held all over the kingdom. He had the greatest sympathy with the assistant medical officers of asylums, because it was very rarely that they had an opportunity of taking part in their discussions. He had endeavoured to obtain the opinions of assistant medical officers on the matter, and they agreed with him that it would be best to increase the meetings instead of cutting up the Association into branches, as it was not large enough. Complaints had often been made of the Association being governed too much by officials, and yet the formation of branches would add considerably to the officials and increase their representation on the Council. The reason why assistant medical officers could not attend the meetings was that the meetings were few, and naturally the superintendents

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

themselves desired to attend as often as possible. He had attended every meeting for the last four years, and consequently his assistant had not able been to attend a single meeting. If the number of meetings were increased the assistants would have a chance. He wished to know whether the proposed division would do away with the quarterly meetings, because, if so, he thought it would be fatal to the Association. In his opinion the splitting up of the Association into branches would do it a great deal of harm.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that the success which had attended the branch meetings in Scotland was a very good argument in favour of the proposition. Everything that Dr. Whitcombe had said he thought went in favour of the branch meetings. It had been found impossible to increase the ordinary meetings and get good attendances, but the branch meetings would put new life into the Association. The meetings would undoubtedly be productive of good results, and would not in any way interfere with the business of the Association. He heartily supported the proposition.

The resolution was then put to the meeting and carried.

Dr. DEAS moved that the mover and seconder of the resolution be added to the Committee for the revision of the rules.

Dr. WEATHERLY seconded the motion.

Dr. NEWINGTON said that there was at the present time no Committee.

Dr. DEAS said that that being the case he would move the reappointment of the Committee, with the addition of Dr. Rayner and Dr. Macdonald.

Dr. OUTTERSON WOOD seconded the motion, which was carried.

Dr. TURNBULL moved :—"That each division shall appoint a Divisional Secretary, who shall be *ex-officio* a member of Council, and shall elect representatives to serve on the Council in such number as the Association may from time to time determine." The Association, he said, had practically adopted the system of branches, and it was essential that there should be some machinery for the carrying on of the branches. He quite agreed with what had been said with regard to the branches confining themselves to scientific work, to the election of members, and local affairs generally, and that they should not interfere with the larger affairs which concerned the whole Association. It was necessary to have something to keep the branches in touch with the Association, and he did not see how it could be better done than by allowing them to elect representatives on the Council.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that there were two matters contained in the resolution —first, that a Divisional Secretary should be appointed, and, secondly, that the division should have power to elect direct representatives on the Council. The two questions were quite different, and he thought Dr. Turnbull should divide his resolution.

Dr. TURNBULL, on the suggestion of Dr. Yellowlees, said that he would divide his resolution, and would accordingly move, firstly :—"That each division shall appoint a Divisional Secretary, who shall as such be a member of Council."

Dr. CAMPBELL seconded the resolution, which was agreed to.

Dr. TURNBULL then moved :—"That each division shall elect representatives to serve on the Council in such number as the Association may from time to time determine."

Dr. CAMPBELL seconded the resolution.

Dr. ERNEST WHITE proposed as an amendment the direct negative. The meeting, he said, had adopted practically with unanimity the suggestion that divisions be formed, but on the distinct understanding that those divisions should not in any way interfere with the Council. They had since consented to the Divisional Secretaries being *ex-officio* members of Council, to represent the views of the divisions to that body, and now the proposer and seconder of this resolution wanted to relegate the election of members of Council to those divisions. It was obvious that this could not be permitted, for it would upset entirely the principle of the Council being elected by the general body of members of the Association.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dr. BOWERS seconded the amendment.

Dr. MICKLE wished to know whether it was intended that the Divisional Secretary should be included in the representatives that the branches would have power to elect, or whether he would be an addition to the number.

Dr. TURNBULL said that he would be one of the representatives.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX said he thought the Divisional Secretaries should be *ex-officio* members of the Council, but that the branches should not have power to elect other representatives.

Dr. SPENCE said he thought it was only a reasonable thing that the divisions should have someone to represent them on the Council. It seemed absurd to give them work to do, and not to give them representation. He thought that it would be a very feasible thing to give the branches power to send one member to the Council in addition to the Secretary, and that the whole of the members should have power to elect the other members. There should be representatives on the Council elected by the divisions, and representatives elected by the whole body of members of the Association.

Dr. MACDONALD said that a great deal might be said in favour of allowing branches to return direct representatives, but he was sure the matter would crop up again before long, and then perhaps the Association would be more willing to consider it.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that the Council at present consisted of officials and of certain elected members. He wished to know whether the proposal was that those members should be elected by the local branches and sent up to the Council?

Dr. TURNBULL said that that was his resolution.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said if that were the case he should oppose it, because it almost amounted to a revolution, and went a great deal farther than the form proposed. He agreed that they should have a Secretary, and, as Dr. Spence suggested, he thought they might have another representative as well, but if the motion was to be so complete as Dr. Turnbull had said he would oppose it.

Dr. TURNBULL said that all he wished was that the branches should have a certain amount of representation. If it was thought best that the representation should consist of one member elected by the division, and that the others should be elected at the annual meeting, he was quite willing to accept it. If it was in order he would add to his resolution the words, "and send one representative to the Council."

A. MEMBER said that Dr. Turnbull was proposing a motion and moving an amendment to it, which certainly could not be done. The motion must be taken on its merits.

Dr. DEAS said that the extent of the representation was entirely a matter for the Committee. The resolution was only to decide that there should be a representation of the branches on the Council.

The amendment was carried by 17 to 10.

The PRESIDENT said that there was no other proposition before the meeting, and he now suggested that the rules should be taken one by one, and amendments proposed where it was thought necessary.

CHAPTER I. (CONSTITUTION).

Rules 1 and 2 were agreed to.

On Rule 3 ("The Association," etc.) Dr. IRELAND said that as the rule stood it would include women. He thought that the admission of women was a question that ought not to be hurried through without a discussion, and he proposed, therefore, as an amendment, that the old rule, "That the Association should consist of (1) legally qualified medical men," etc., should be allowed to stand.

Dr. KEAY seconded the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS supported the amendment. He would suggest that the word "male" be introduced before the word "practitioners." There could be no mistake then, and it would not allow anyone to say that the word "men" included women.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that at the present day it would not do to keep women out of the Association. The law had given them the right to practise, the British Medical Association had admitted them, and it would be unwise conservatism to exclude them. There was even a stronger reason why they should be admitted. Science knew nothing about sex, and the question of delicacy could not be brought forward. Women naturally knew more about women than men, and their assistance would be of very great value. The opinion of the American Superintendents was that the lady doctors were of very great value and assistance. He intended having a female medical assistant as soon as he could get one, and he could not understand why they should be excluded from the Association.

Dr. SAVAGE said that there were many Societies which admitted lady members. Of course there was a great difference between admitting them to the Association and allowing them to take part in the business of the Association. He quite thought the time had come when women should be recognized as assistants.

Dr. IRELAND said that there was a great difference between recognizing the right of women to be admitted to the profession and admitting them as members of a particular Association. There were many matters which came before the Association which it would be very disagreeable to have to discuss before women.

Dr. BENHAM said that as the seconder of Dr. Howden's amendment at the Buxton meeting he desired to say that the amendment was not moved with the idea of voting against the admission of women, but simply because the matter was sprung upon them at the end of a discussion without the Association having notice of it. He had since considered the question, and he thought that as ladies were now admitted to the profession, and as superintendents were taking them into asylums, it was only right that they should have the advantage of coming to their meetings, and hear matters discussed with regard to the insane and with regard to the treatment of the insane.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said that at first he was as strong an opponent as anyone to the admission of women to the medical profession, but when it was decided to admit them he sank his opinion. If ladies were to be admitted to the profession at all, it was only right that they should be admitted to all the privileges attaining thereto. He was glad to hear Dr. Benham's explanation of the resolution passed at Buxton, because there was some difference of feeling as regards the action of the Association at that meeting.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX said that he only voted for the amendment at Buxton on a question of English grammar, and not because it was proposed to admit ladies to the Association. He was now going to vote for their admission.

Dr. Ireland's amendment was then put, seven voting for it and 23 against. The new rule providing for the admission of ladies was then agreed to.

Dr. RAYNER proposed that the word "registered" be inserted before the word "practitioner," which was agreed to.

Dr. YELLOWLEES proposed that it should read "registered medical practitioners," which was agreed to.

On Rule 4 the PRESIDENT said that since it had been decided to admit ladies he thought that it should be specially mentioned in the rules.

Dr. WHITCOMBE thought the necessary alteration might be left to the Rules Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

On Clause 3, Dr. WHITE suggested that as Branch Secretaries were to be appointed the word "branch" should be inserted before the word "Secretary," as the Branch Secretaries would have the right to convene their own meetings.

The PRESIDENT said it was a matter for the Rules Committee.

Clause 3 was then agreed to.

Rules 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 were agreed to.

On Rule 12 Dr. MACDONALD said he thought it was going too far to bring a member's name before the Annual Meeting because his subscription was not paid. He thought the name should first be brought before the Council, who

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

should be asked to report. Perhaps it could be left to the Committee to alter the rule.

Agreed that the rule should be so altered.

On Rules 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 Dr. NEWINGTON said that, with regard to Rule 18, he thought it was only right that the honorary members should be restricted from voting for the Council. The honorary members in a great many instances were prevented from taking part in the discussions, and it was only right that they should not be allowed to vote.

The PRESIDENT said the introduction of the words "except the power of voting" would meet Dr. Newington's suggestion.

Dr. MACDONALD proposed that the word "general" should be inserted before the word "secretary" in Rule 17.

Dr. TURNBULL said that it was mooted that the Association was going to be registered, and if that were the case the rules would require alteration. He proposed, therefore, that if the Association were registered the Rules Committee should be empowered to alter the rules where necessary.

Dr. HACK TUKE agreed with Dr. Turnbull.

Dr. NEWINGTON said the question was discussed at Liverpool, but it was then decided that there was no question of registration before the meeting. Of course, if the Association were registered an alteration of the rules would be necessary.

Rules 14 to 22 were then agreed to.

CHAPTER II. (OFFICERS).

On Rule 1, Dr. DEAS wished to know whether the four Divisional Secretaries would be considered as officers of the Association.

Dr. NEWINGTON—Certainly.

Dr. CAMPBELL moved that the two auditors should be excluded. He thought the time had come when the Association should have a paid auditor. He moved formally, "That the words 'a paid auditor' be inserted instead of the words 'two auditors.'"

Dr. MERCIER protested against the removal of the honorary auditors. They could not have too many checks as regarded auditing, and a paid auditor was not always to be depended upon. If a paid auditor were engaged he suggested that the honorary auditors should be retained as well.

Dr. HACK TUKE said he quite agreed with Dr. Mercier. The Association as a fact had had a chartered accountant for a number of years. He was strongly in favour of the honorary auditors being retained.

Dr. RAYNER said he fully agreed with Dr. Mercier that the honorary auditors should be retained.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX said he also should vote against any change being made with regard to the auditors.

Dr. MACDONALD said that if the auditors were to remain *ex-officio* members of the Council they would now have an unwieldy number on the Council.

Dr. SPENCE wished to know whether Dr. Campbell proposed to exclude the auditors from the Council only, or to do away with them altogether.

Dr. CAMPBELL said his motion was that Rule 1 should stop at the word "Journal."

Dr. DEAS seconded the motion, which on being put to the meeting was lost, 11 voting in favour of it and 18 against it.

On Rule 2, Dr. DEAS pointed out that Rule 2 would require to be altered in consequence of the "divisions" having been adopted. The Secretaries would now be elected by the members resident in their divisions.

Rule 2 was then agreed to.

On Rules 3 to 5 Dr. FOX said that there was some question at the last Annual Meeting as to whether the President should have the power of interpreting the rules.

The PRESIDENT said that he was bound to maintain the dignity of the chair.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If his ruling were appealed to he should expect it to be obeyed. He would rather vacate the chair than suffer any impositions of that kind.

Rules 3, 4, and 5 were then agreed to.

On Rules 6 to 12 the TREASURER (Dr. Macdonald) said that some difficulty was found at Buxton in fixing the date of the Annual Meeting owing to the date at which the accounts were made up.

The PRESIDENT said he had received a letter from the Treasurer, Dr. Paul, in which he stated that the accounts should be terminated on the 30th June.

The SECRETARY—They do terminate on that date now.

Dr. OUTTERSON WOOD said the present system worked well and in no way clashed with the Annual Meeting.

Dr. MACDONALD said he should move that it be an instruction to the Rules Committee to consider the dates when the accounts should be made up so as not to interfere with the Annual Meeting.

Dr. NEWINGTON said it had been considered by the Rules Committee, by the Council, and by the Association, and it had been purposely left open by the Rules Committee so that the Association could take the matter into its own hands at the proper time.

Dr. BOWERS proposed that the words "and audited by a paid accountant appointed by the Council" should be inserted after the words "balanced yearly."

Dr. MACDONALD seconded the resolution.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that Rule 9 stated that a professional accountant was to be engaged. If the words "and audit them" were inserted at the end of that rule it would meet Dr. Bowers' suggestion.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said he did not think the Association would be so foolish as to allow the Treasurer to engage his own auditor.

Dr. Bowers' amendment was then put to the meeting and declared lost, 12 voting in its favour and 13 against.

Rules 13 and 14 were then agreed to.

Rules 15 and 16, (the Secretaries) were agreed to.

On Rule 17, Dr. RAYNER proposed that the rule be omitted. He did not wish to say anything about the principle of paying the expenses of the Secretaries, but it was clear that the Association could not afford it.

Dr. CAMPBELL seconded the proposition.

Drs. WHITE, NEWINGTON, HACK TUKE, and DEAS supported the proposition on these grounds, and it was agreed to.

Rules 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 were agreed to.

On Rules 25 to 30 ("the Registrar"), Dr. SPENCE said that with regard to Rule 28 he had received a letter from Dr. Tuke asking whether it was necessary to print all the names of those who had received certificates of proficiency in nursing and attending on the insane. The list would take up a whole quarterly number of the Journal, and he proposed that only the names of those who had received certificates during the past year should be included.

Dr. TUKE seconded. He said it was impossible to give all the names.

The amendment was agreed to.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that Rule 27 required alteration in the same way.

The PRESIDENT—That will be referred to the Rules Committee. It certainly wants altering.

Rules 25 to 30 were then agreed to.

CHAPTER III. (THE COUNCIL).

On Rule 1 Dr. DEAS said he should move that the rule read—"That the affairs of the Association shall be managed by a Council consisting of (1) the President, Ex-President, President-Elect, General Secretary, Registrar, Editor or Editors of the Journal; (2) 18 elected members; and (3) four Divisional Secretaries, to be elected by the members in each division."

Dr. NEWINGTON said Dr. Deas was mixing up two things. The Rules Com-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mittee would take note of his suggestion with regard to distinguishing the Secretaries, but apparently Dr. Deas wished to leave out the auditors.

Dr. DEAS said that was part of his amendment.

Dr. WHITE said the real point was the omission of the auditors. He thought it would be a great mistake to take them off the Council. The auditors knew the inner working of the Association, they were a check on the Treasurer, and they were most important members of the Council.

Dr. Deas' amendment, which was seconded by Mr. RICHARDS, was then put to the meeting and lost, seven voting in favour and fifteen against.

Rule 1 was then agreed to.

Rules 2, 3, and 4 were agreed to.

On Rule 5, Dr. NEWINGTON said he should like to add the word "ordinary" before the word "members," so as to shut out the honorary and corresponding members.

Dr. CAMPBELL said that the Association only wished to exclude them from the business matters, but they would be glad to see them at the ordinary meetings for the discussion of scientific matters, etc.

Dr. NEWINGTON said that if that were the wish of the meeting the committee would bear it in mind. He thought, however, that it would be agreed that they were not to receive voting papers.

Dr. DEAS said that in Rule 4 it was laid down that candidates for election to the Council should have their nomination sent in two months before the Annual Meeting, and Rule 5 stated that a list of retiring officers and members of Council, with the number of their attendances, should be sent to every member. The information given to members as provided by Rule 5 was of no use, because the nominations had to be sent in before they received it.

Dr. NEWINGTON said the information would be of no use in that connection, because there was no question of voting for retiring members of Council, but new men who had not before been on the Council. The information was intended to show the members how the members of the Council fulfilled their duties.

Dr. SPENCE said that if a member of Council did not attend during the year his name should be struck off.

Dr. WHITE said it was a most important matter that members of Council should attend.

Dr. SPENCE said that the clause was really a compromise between the various members of the Committee. Some of the Committee wished to make it much stronger, and he still thought it did not go far enough. The proposition he would like to make would be that each member should have sent to him a month before the Annual Meeting a paper giving the number of vacancies to be filled up at the Annual Meeting, the names of those who were not eligible, and a list of those men whom the Council suggested as suitable men to fill the vacancies. Every member would have an opportunity then of putting his pen through any or all the names, and substituting others.

Dr. NEWINGTON said they had gone even further than that. Everybody was at liberty to vote for whom he liked.

Dr. DEAS said that if anything would lead to the proposal which had been brought forward that day being carried, it would be the election of members of Council. It was proposed to have direct representation, but it was carried out in a most unworkable manner. The proposal that the members in the different divisions should each elect a proportion of members of Council would be found before long to be the only solution of the question. The present rule would only work out into an absurdity.

Dr. MERCIER said the same method was adopted by the Royal College of Surgeons, and worked very well. He could not understand Dr. Deas' objection.

Dr. WEATHERLY said that, as they all knew, he very much wanted the Association to adopt proxy voting. His resolution on that point, however, was not

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

adopted, and as a compromise it was carried that the Council should be elected by individual members by proxy voting. The objections which Dr. Deas put forward to the proposed arrangement could be urged just as much if the divisions each elected a proportion of the members of Council.

Dr. CHAPMAN said that possibly those members who wished to nominate somebody would forget all about it until the two months had expired and they received the circular.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said he quite agreed with Dr. Chapman, and he wished to propose an amendment. He would propose: "That Clause 4 be omitted, and Clause 5 modified so that a circular be sent by the General Secretary to each member one month before the Annual Meeting, giving a record of attendances at Council and names of retiring members, whether through lapse of time or non-attendance, and that each member return a voting paper (which shall accompany the circular) with the names of those he desires to be elected to the vacancies, within fourteen days, to the Secretary, duly signed."

Dr. WEATHERLY seconded the amendment, which was carried by sixteen votes to two.

On the amendment being put as a substantive motion,

Dr. BOWERS proposed that the words "or by non-attendance" be excluded. He thought it was possible to conceive that an important member of Council might not be able to attend any of the meetings during one year, especially seeing that such meetings might be comparatively unimportant.

Dr. WHITE thought it was not asking very much to say that a member of Council should attend one meeting out of possibly five or six. It was not too much that he should be asked to attend once.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX said there was an additional reason why entire non-attendance in a year should vacate a man's office. By the form of nomination, the nominator had to state that the person nominated was "willing, if elected, to serve on the Council." He thought that when a man assented to serve on the Council he might be expected to do so.

Dr. DEAS said that form of nomination was done away with.

The amendment was not seconded, and the substantive motion was agreed to.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX asked whether the rule just passed specifically stated that if a member of Council did not attend at all his seat was thereby vacated.

The PRESIDENT said that was so.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said that being the case it was obvious that Rule 6 required a verbal alteration to state that no member should give more votes than the number of vacancies which had occurred.

Agreed to.

Rules 7, 8, 9 and 10 were agreed to.

RULE 11 (NOMINATION OF OFFICERS).

Dr. NEWINGTON said this had already been provided for by Rule 2, Chapter 2.

Dr. YELLOWLEES thought it was a matter for the Council's convenience as to when they should meet. This rule required that the circular should be sent out at least two months before the Annual Meeting.

Dr. NEWINGTON thought that the Rule was redundant.

On Rule 12 ("at least three months," etc.), Dr. NEWINGTON said there were two other rules dealing with this question in which the number of months was stated to be two instead of three. He did not think that three months would work.

Dr. DEAS suggested that some little modification was required in connection with the instruction previously carried with regard to the formation of divisions. If it was understood that the ordinary meeting was to be held in the division, the time and place must be settled by the Secretary and members residing in the division. The rule would have to be altered accordingly.

Rules 13, 14, and 15 were agreed to.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CHAPTER IV. (MEETINGS).

On Rule 1 ("The meeting of the Association," etc.), the PRESIDENT said that rule would have to be referred back to the Committee.

Dr. YELLOWLEES said the word "ordinary" could not possibly refer to district meetings.

Dr. DEAS asked what was the meaning of "ordinary" meetings as specified in Rule 1. It seemed to him that there would be no "ordinary meetings," but they would be supplanted by the "divisional meetings."

Dr. MERCIER said surely there would be "ordinary meetings" of the whole Association.

Dr. DEAS said the only meetings would be annual and special.

Dr. MERCIER asked if it was intended to do away with the ordinary meetings altogether?

Dr. DEAS said that would obviously follow. In order that the matter should be argued out he would move that the word "ordinary" be omitted. They would then have to alter the word "three" into "two."

Dr. CAMPBELL seconded.

After a long discussion, in which Drs. Yellowlees, White, Mercier, Spence, Fox, Whitcombe, Rayner, Wood, and Newington took part,

Dr. DEAS expressed his willingness to withdraw the motion on the condition that the word "divisional" should be inserted, and on the suggestion that the word "general" should be substituted for "ordinary." He was quite prepared to move that the meetings of the Association should be of four kinds, annual, general, divisional, and special.

Agreed to.

Rule 2 ("Regulations to govern proceedings at meetings") was agreed to.

On Rule 3 ("Any member unable to attend," etc.), Dr. CAMPBELL thought it might be advisable to limit that rule.

Dr. YELLOWLEES objected to the rule as being unreasonable.

It was resolved that Rule 3 be omitted.

Rules 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 were agreed to.

On Rule 9, Dr. BONVILLE FOX asked the Rules Committee whether it would not be desirable to insert the words "annual" or "special."

Dr. YELLOWLEES said it might happen that at any of the ordinary general meetings of the Association it would be very needful that some resolution which implied some expenditure of funds should be dealt with.

Dr. NEWINGTON saw no objection to Dr. Fox's proposal to add the words "or special."

Agreed to.

Rules 10 and 11 were agreed to.

On Rule 12 (Ordinary meetings), Dr. DEAS suggested that the word "general" should be substituted for "ordinary" in all the sections.

Dr. MERCIER presumed that these rules would have to be modified in accordance with the decision of the meeting.

The PRESIDENT said that that would no doubt be the case.

The rule was agreed to.

Rules 13, 14, 15, and 16 were agreed to.

On Rule 17 ("No resolution," etc.), Dr. YELLOWLEES thought that rule was rather tying the hands of an ordinary meeting.

Dr. NEWINGTON said the rule was really framed as the result of actual facts that had occurred. For instance, with regard to the motion to be brought forward by Dr. Campbell, although it might well be discussed by the present meeting, which was a very large and representative one, he did not think the word of the Association should be pledged to a resolution of that kind by an ordinary divisional meeting. There ought to be some restraining power to enable the Council or President to say, "You may discuss this as much as you like, but the vote of the Association cannot be taken at this meeting."

Dr. YELLOWLEES agreed that it would not do to let a Divisional Meeting

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commit the Association to any course of action. He, however, objected to the idea that a question should not be put to the vote. He saw no reason why a divisional meeting should not express its mind upon a certain question, and make a representation to the Council.

Dr. NEWINGTON said what the rule stated was that no resolution should be submitted to a vote against the approval of the President or Council.

Rule agreed to.

Rules 18 (special meetings), 19, 20, and 21 were agreed to.

On Rule 22 Dr. DEAS asked what length of notice was to be given of a special meeting?

The PRESIDENT thought that might surely be left to the Secretary.

Dr. DEAS said that the time for general meetings was fourteen days by Rule 14.

The rule was agreed to.

Rules 23 and 24 (strangers at meetings) were agreed to.

CHAPTER V. (COMMITTEES).

Rules 1 to 10 were put *en bloc*.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX said there was a consequential amendment in Rule 5, which would have to provide that no committee should be appointed, etc., "except at an annual or special meeting." That would, of course, be necessary in consequence of the alteration in Rule 9, Chapter 4.

Agreed to.

Dr. MERCIER asked when the rules would come into operation supposing they were adopted at that meeting?

Dr. WHITCOMBE said the meeting was not adopting them. They were merely instructing the Committee.

The PRESIDENT said the rules must come before the Association again for confirmation after the Rules Committee had dealt with them.

Dr. WHITCOMBE presumed that the rules which had been approved would stand, and the other rules would be amended. It would be very unfortunate if they had to go through the rules again at some further meeting, and then to have to approve them at a special meeting subsequently called.

The PRESIDENT said what he meant was that the Association would have the opportunity of seeing the amendments.

APPENDIX TO RULES (FORMS A, B, C, AND D).

Dr. PERCY SMITH said in form D the Registrar was not mentioned. He was *ex-officio* a member of the Council.

Dr. FLETCHER BEACH said the form as printed followed the old form; undoubtedly the Registrar should be included.

PART 2.—REGULATIONS.

1.—THE CERTIFICATE IN PSYCHOLOGICAL MEDICINE.

Dr. BONVILLE FOX said it should be made perfectly clear what was meant by the term "sufficient opportunity for the study of mental disorders," as otherwise it might give rise to some difference of opinion.

The PRESIDENT said that would appear to be provided for by the words "or they shall give such proof of experience in lunacy as shall in the opinion of the President be sufficient."

Dr. DEAS said in that case the words "affording sufficient opportunity for the study of mental disorders" might be omitted. If there was no machinery for defining the sufficient opportunity the clause was unnecessary.

Dr. MERCIER asked why there should be a certificate of having resided in an "asylum?"

Dr. NEWINGTON thought "institution" would be the better word. "An institution for the treatment of insanity" would be quite sufficient.

This was agreed to.

Dr. YELLOWLEES suggested that it would be better to put in "having attended a qualifying course of lectures," instead of "a course of lectures on insanity for three months."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The PRESIDENT said in that case they would have to define the word "qualifying."

Dr. PERCY SMITH said that three months was none too much for men who were going in for examination.

Dr. YELLOWLEES thought the mere period stood for nothing. The number of lectures attended was the point. They in Scotland were bound by what was required by the medical bodies who licensed the students.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said Scotland enjoyed privileges which England did not possess in this matter. Coming to the next question, "They must be registered under the Medical Act before the certificate is bestowed," Scotland enjoyed the privilege of allowing its medical students to pass the examination and receive the certificate at some date much later than their actually becoming qualified. He believed that was so; that medical students were allowed to pass the examination and the certificate was held until they were qualified. They, therefore, held peculiar advantages which were not possessed in England.

Dr. PERCY SMITH said under the curriculum for medical students in England it would be compulsory on every man to have attended three months. He did not think they should make it less than that.

Dr. DEAS moved that the rule be altered to read "of having attended a course of not less than forty lectures on insanity."

Dr. YELLOWLEES said the unanimous recommendation of the Education Committee was that eighteen to twenty lectures were as much as were necessary. He thought that whatever satisfied the Examining Board ought to satisfy the Association. If they could not demand a course of more than twenty lectures, what was the necessity of spinning that over three months when it might be done in two months or two months and a half.

The rule was referred back to the committee.

Clauses 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3, "The prize dissertation" and "The Gaskell prize," were agreed to.

SECTION 4 (PROFICIENCY IN NURSING AND ATTENDING ON THE INSANE).

Dr. NEWINGTON said that within three or four days a very curious circumstance had occurred, which demanded treatment at the hands of the Association. A nurse at Manchester had brought a body of governors before the High Court of Justice under the following circumstances:—She had been a nurse at the Manchester Royal Hospital, where the regulations were that any person trained for three years in the infirmary should be allowed to submit themselves for examination, and if they passed should receive the certificate of efficiency. Having served three years, this young woman was requested before she went up for examination to go to a small cottage hospital where there had been small-pox cases. After four of five days she got dissatisfied and left, saying it was not a proper place for small-pox cases, and she was dismissed thereupon by the superintendent. She claimed to go up for examination, but the Governors declined to allow her to do so on the grounds that she had deserted her service. She said that she had been there for the three years, and if she could pass the examination she was entitled to the certificate. The Court decided against the Governors, that, notwithstanding her disobedience, having been trained for three years, she was entitled to submit herself for examination. It was possible that they might have cases to deal with of a similar kind, and they should fortify their position by adding to the regulations on page 19 some such clause as this, "The President may, if he thinks fit, order that the examination of a candidate be postponed, in which case he shall inform the Council at its next meeting of the fact and of his reasons for thus acting. That the Council shall consider the matter, and may order that the candidate shall be refused admittance at the ensuing or any examination." If the Association thought it would be wise to add something of that kind, he would undertake to submit a properly drawn addition to the rules.

Agreed to.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dr. SPENCE asked if it was to be understood that Rule 8 on page 20 was to be cancelled.

The PRESIDENT—That is omitted.

The appendix to the regulations, Forms A, B, and C, were agreed to.

On the motion of Dr. WHITCOMBE, seconded by Dr. SPENCE, it was agreed that the meeting should be adjourned until 10 a.m. on the third Thursday in February at Oxford.

Dr. SPENCE suggested that when the rules were reprinted those already agreed to should be printed in one type and those amended by the instruction of the Association in another, so that it might be seen at once what rules had still to be considered.

MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

QUARTERLY MEETING, Nov. 16.

Dr. JAMES MURRAY LINDSAY in the chair.

The following candidates were elected:—

THOMAS SPROTT ALLAN, L.R.C.P.Edin., and L.M., L.R.C.S.Edin., etc., Medical Attendant "Redlands" Private Asylum, Tonbridge, Salford House, Tonbridge, Kent.

JOSEPH HERBERT BAYLEY, M.B., C.M.Edin., Assistant Medical Officer, St. Andrew's Hospital, Northampton.

ARTHUR DRURY, M.B., C.M.Edin., Medical Officer, Halifax Union, Landon House, Halifax.

JOHN GORDON GORDON-MUNN, M.B, C.M.Edin., Assistant Medical Officer, London County Asylum, Cane Hill, Purley, Surrey.

ROBERT HENRY WATSON, M.A., M.B., C.M.Edin., Assistant Medical Officer, Inverness District Asylum.

CHARLES EDWARD PATERSON, M.D.Edin., Arnold House, Farnborough, Hants.

LEWIS C. BRUCE, M.B.Edin., Assistant Medical Officer, Derby Borough Asylum, Rowditch, Derby.

Dr. CAMPBELL moved the following resolution, which stood over from the Annual Meeting:—"That the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland are unanimously of opinion that the grant of 4s. a week at present given to Boards of Guardians to pay for pauper lunatics in County Asylums, Registered Hospitals, and Licensed Houses should also be given for pauper lunatics (*i.e.*, 'dements' and 'imbeciles') in Workhouse wards, or boarded out, if kept to the satisfaction of the Commissioners in Lunacy." This has been done in Scotland since 1874. "That this resolution be sent by the General Secretary to the President of the Local Government Board and to the Commissioners in Lunacy, asking them to assist in carrying the terms of the resolution into effect." He said he was very sorry that at Buxton some members seemed to think this resolution had been sprung upon them. It was not so, for it was brought forward with the leave of the Council. There was no wish on his part to spring the resolution. The fact was that the Committee of Visitors from the Cumberland and Westmorland Asylum were at the time agitating the question, and he thought the occasion opportune to bring the matter before the Association. Some of those present might be acquainted with the action of this 4s. grant. An Act was passed in 1874 giving 4s. a-week for each pauper lunatic in a public asylum. There was an extraordinary increase of admissions in 1875. Dr. Maudsley in a paper in the "Journal of Mental Science" for April, 1877, said: "The effect has been to empty the workhouses of all the cases which it was possible by any device to send to the asylum, and to remove the last vestige of desire which there might be to retain a pauper patient under any sort of care outside an asylum. The

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.40.168.148 Published online by Cambridge University Press