THE MEDICO-LEGAL SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

This Society has issued a circular in which it is stated that the recent session of the International Congress of Medical Jurisprudence was highly successful. It perfected a permanent organization, and provided for the selection of an additional Vice-President from each State and Territory of the American Union, and from each foreign province, State, and country who had members in the organization that took an interest in the success of the movement.

The expenses of publishing all the papers read at this Congress, with a record of its transactions and the proceedings at the banquet, will fill a large volume, the expense of which is estimated will be about $700. The Executive Officers were authorized to elect additional members into the organization, the only expense of which is the enrolling fee of $3.00, which entitles the member to the bulletin free.

It is desired that others will unite in this movement with a view of making it International, and promoting the advancement of medical jurisprudence, not alone within the United States of America, but throughout the civilized world.

Those who desire to be enrolled are requested to communicate with either of the undersigned:—

MORITZ ELLINGER,
Surrogate's Office,
New York City.

CLARK BELL,
President,
57, Broadway, N.Y.

ASSOCIATION EXAMINATIONS.

EXAMINATION FOR THE CERTIFICATE OF EFFICIENCY IN PSYCHOLOGICAL MEDICINE, BETHLEM HOSPITAL.

JULY, 1889.

Examiners:

Dr. BLANDFORD and Dr. RAYNER.

PASS EXAMINATION.

T. Gordon Meikle, M.B., C.M. Edin., Bethlem Hospital.

HONOURS EXAMINATION.

(GASKELL PRIZE.)

Theo. B. Hyslop, M.B., C.M. Edin., Bethlem Hospital.

SCOTLAND.

JULY, 1889.

PASS EXAMINATION.

Examiner in Edinburgh: Dr. YELLOWLEES. *Assessor:* Dr. CLOUSTON.
Examiner in Aberdeen: Dr. ROBIE. *Assessor:* Dr. REID.

James Brown Bird, Edinburgh.
William Bullock, Aberdeen.
Arthur W. Carter, Edinburgh.
William Davidson, Aberdeen.
Russell John Drummond, Edinburgh.
Henry Martyn Eames, Edinburgh.
Gerald Fitzgerald, Edinburgh.
Donald Allen Fraser, Edinburgh.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.35.151.474-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

George Hennan, Edinburgh.
Matthew L. Hewat, Edinburgh.
James Monteith, Edinburgh.
James Rannie, Aberdeen.
Robert Renton, Edinburgh.
Thomas Morton Ritchie, Edinburgh.
John Douglas Stanley, Edinburgh.
William Day Stewart, Edinburgh.
Robert Richard Harvey Whitwell, Edinburgh.
James Wilson, Aberdeen.

IRELAND.

JUNE, 1889.

Examiners:

Dr. RINGROSE ATKINS and Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN.

PASS EXAMINATION.

Carlo Raymond Zimmer, M.B., B.Ch., B.A.O., of the Royal University of Ireland.

N.B.—The questions asked in these Examinations will be printed in the next number of the Journal.

The next Examination for England will be held at Bethlem Hospital in December. For other particulars, and for the Scotch and Irish Examinations, apply to the Secretaries, as given in the list of Officers and Members at the end of this number.

Correspondence.

ON THE USE OF RESTRAINT IN THE CARE OF THE INSANE.

To the Editors of the "JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE."

GENTLEMEN,—The questions which interest the public, lay and medical, in this discussion, are: Has there been a return to any considerable extent in the treatment of the insane in the asylums of the kingdom to the use of instruments of restraint which had been all but abandoned? and, if so, Have the results of reverting to old methods been so satisfactory as to fully justify this retrograde step? A mere expression of opinion on the part of any physician that he considers restraint necessary in certain cases is of little moment in the determining of the latter question; for it is evident that another medical man, who approves of the non-restraint principle, may succeed in treating such cases to a successful conclusion by other means. I presume that the most resolute advocates of restraint in its cruellest forms and darkest days would advance similar reasons for their practice—would maintain that the use of these instruments was indispensable in certain cases, and would also object to any interference with their liberty of action. However, more is required than opinion; the question must be submitted to the stern logic of facts.

It was a conviction that a comparison of results by the advocates of the minimum, and those of the more extended use of restraint was

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.35.151.474-a Published online by Cambridge University Press