younger and enthusiastic member. Dr. Turnbull had exceptionally high qualities for the secretaryship; his courtesy and his attention to business were beyond all praise. (Hear, hear, and applause.) He thought that he was only expressing the feeling of the Association when he said how very much they thanked him for doing as he had done for them. That did not prevent them from welcoming Dr. Bruce, who was here for the first time as Secretary. (Applause.) Perhaps he might also mention, as a subject of pleasure to them, that Drs. Oswald, Marr, and Parker had become superintendents of asylums since they last met.

On the motion of Dr. YELLOWLEES, seconded by Dr. CLOUSTON, it was resolved that the Association should incorporate in its minutes a copy of the minute sent to Mrs. Clark and also that they should record their special thanks to Dr. Turnbull.

Dr. CARLYLE JOHNSTONE said he should like to add a word to what had been already said in regard to their friend Dr. Clark. He was a friend of his of twenty years' standing. They were fellow-workers together at Morningside. He had visited him at Bothwell, where he converted what was really an inferior dwelling into a first-class district asylum, and he had also visited him frequently at Hartwood, so that he could speak as one who knew him very well. He was gentle and generous, a simple and broad-minded man, a man who never harboured any rancour or bore any malice. He was certainly the enemy of no man. He thought that if Dr. Clark's spirit could possibly be listening to them it would be a pleasure to him to know that he was appreciated during his lifetime, and that at his death he was not going to be forgotten. He had gone to a rest which he had honourably earned, and his name would be added to that honourable list of names of those who had worked among the insane, for the insane, and given their lives for the insane.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Secretary to draw up a minute in both of these cases.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved of.

The SECRETARY then read letters of apology from Drs. Oswald, Parker, Allan, Urquhart, and others.

The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with the resolution of the last meeting the discussion would be resumed as to the questions of publishing the "Report of the Committee on Nursing Staffs of the Scottish Asylums."

After a prolonged discussion it was resolved that the report should not be published.

It was further resolved that the copies of the report which had been printed and marked "for private use only" should be sent to the members of the Scottish Division.

Dr. G. M. ROBERTSON read a paper entitled, "Hospital Ideals in the Care of the Insane: a statement of certain methods in use at the Stirling District Asylum, Larbert" (see page 261).

A cordial vote of thanks was accorded to Sir John Sibbald, who had to leave before the termination of the meeting, and Dr. Rorie was chosen to fill his place.

A paper contributed by Drs. A. R. Urquhart and W. Ford Robertson entitled, "A Case of Epilepsy following Traumatic Lesion of Prefrontal Lobe," was not read owing to the advanced hour of the day.

A vote of thanks was enthusiastically accorded to Dr. Robertson, and the meeting terminated.

IRISH DIVISION.

A Meeting of the Irish Division was held at the College of Physicians, Dublin, on February 18th, 1902.

The following members were present: President, Dr. Oscar Woods, in the Chair. Drs. Molony, Nolan, Cullinan, Donelan, Mills, O'Mara, Harvey, Drapes, Oakshott, Leeper, Ellison, Moore, Hetherington, Lawless, Dawson, Eustace, Rambaut, Conolly Norman, and Arthur Finegan, Hon. Sec., etc.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read and confirmed, Michael

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Curran, M.A., M.B., Assistant Medical Officer, St. Patrick's Hospital, Dublin, was proposed for membership by Drs. Molony, Leeper, and Finegan, and unanimously elected.

The PRESIDENT read a letter of apology from Dr. O'Neill, of Limerick, in whose name a notice of motion stood on the paper. Dr. O'Neill explained that he had met with a serious accident and was unable to be present.

The PRESIDENT proceeded: The first resolution is in the name of Dr. O'Neill. In his absence no doubt some one will propose it for him.

Dr. O'MARA.—Dr. O'Neill asked me to propose the resolution standing in his name, which I do. It runs as follows:—"That the Irish Division of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland earnestly desires to call the attention of Government to the injustice inflicted on Irish asylum officials by the permissive clause of the existing Act of Parliament dealing with the question of superannuation. It respectfully urges on the Government to make more secure the provision for old age in the asylum service. The arduous duties, responsibilities, and constant contact of asylum officials with the insane call for exceptional consideration as regards superannuation. It was apparently intended that the granting of pensions under the Act 53 and 54, cap. 3, though nominally permissive, should practically be recognised as a matter of right, but the word 'may' leaves it entirely at the discretion of committees to grant anything they wish, and from which decision there is no appeal. The Division respectfully urges on the Government an alteration of the said clause by the introduction of the word 'shall,' instead of 'may,' or by the introduction of a pension scheme securing assured pensions. That a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the Right Hon. George Wyndham, M.P., Chief Secretary for Ireland." In addition to that I got a circular this morning from Dr. O'Neill, containing a very important modification of this resolution.

The circular, which was here submitted by Dr. O'Mara for Dr. O'Neill, contained the draft of an entirely fresh scheme for pensions, altering the terms under which superannuation could be sought in many important particulars.

Dr. FINEGAN proposed that, as there were several schemes to be considered, it would be well if they were discussed together first before coming to a conclusion with regard to any one of them.

The President approving it was agreed to adopt this course.

Dr. HARVEY seconded Dr. O'Mara's resolution for purposes of discussion. He said: That it is desirable to get compulsory pensions which the resolution aims at no one has any doubt. But the questions arise, Is the present a desirable time to approach this matter? and What are our chances of success? As regards the point whether this is an opportune time or not, there is no doubt that under the changes which the asylums in Ireland have recently undergone there is a strong feeling in favour of keeping authority as much as possible in local hands. At the same time it is practically acknowledged we are entitled to a pension. I know that my committee so far have dealt very fairly in the matter. I summoned my staff together and explained the matter to them, and we decided that at present we have no complaint; but we are prepared to follow any course which the majority of the asylums decide on. With regard to the possibilities of the success of a scheme for compulsory pensions, I do not think there would be great opposition. It might be a very wise course to ask the asylum committees to meet a committee of this body to consider the question. I think the asylum committees might be very glad to have a regular fixed scale when giving their decisions. I had the honour of being appointed, when the Local Government Bill was going through, to go over to the House of Commons with Dr. Norman and Dr. Finegan, and we interviewed a great many members of Parliament. They all acknowledged that if any service was entitled to a pension that ours was. I am sure Dr. Finegan will bear me out. The Government also acknowledged the justice of our contention, but they said they would not give us anything except what we already had.

Dr. NOLAN moved, on notice, "That the attention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland be directed to the grave disadvantages to Irish asylum officials arising out of the repeal of secs. 3 and 4, 53 and 54 Vic., cap. 31, by the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and that he be urged to introduce an amendment at the first opportunity restoring the deleted sections of the Pauper Lunatic Asylum (Ireland)

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Superannuation Act, 1890." With regard to this resolution, it does not attempt to discuss any new scheme; it merely suggests we should strive to get what Dr. Harvey said he was assured we could easily secure, namely, the same terms as we had before recent legislation. My resolution claims for us at least the right we had under the Pensions Act of 1890, the right of appeal. This we are now deprived of under the Local Government Act. Dr. Nolan went on to say it appears to be an extraordinary thing that we should be asked at one of our divisional meetings to formulate a scheme right off which can be taken up by the Legislature at any time. Instead of one well-considered scheme being brought up for ratification there are several schemes, none of which, except the one Dr. Finegan honoured us by sending round, have been considered by the superintendents or the people interested. I do not think any other body of men occupying the position we do would approach a subject of this magnitude in the same complacent manner. No real attempt has been made to formulate any one scheme that could be put before Parliament. I do not think there is the slightest chance of getting any new scheme passed at this particular time. All we can hope to do is to secure the rights we had under the old Act. The whole conduct of this business seems to be most unfortunate. One of our superintendents goes over to the English meeting and puts forward a proposal there. We have not heard what came of this. Then we are asked to attend to-morrow a meeting of our subordinate officers without having had full time to consider all the schemes before us. I think it a very unhappy occurrence that we are summoned to attend the meeting to-morrow, considering how we are placed with reference to our staffs. These men will come to consult us on the question of pensions, and we ought to be in a position to advise them. Up to this year in the history of the Association the medical officers always managed their own affairs. On the question of superannuation, in which the interests of the superintendents are identified with those of the staff down to the most junior servant, it might have been assumed that whatever the superintendents decided was the wisest and best course would prove to be for the benefit of all in the institution. Instead of that we are called to meet to-morrow a number of people coming up from different parts of the country with ideas of different schemes. I do not know how we could possibly in the short interval think over the schemes that are here to-day. In England, when they had a similar movement, it was only proposed after the most elaborate statistical investigation, with the aid of chartered accountants, and all the information that could be possibly brought to bear from every possible source was in the hands of the members for months previously. Here we are brought up to-day and we see on the agenda paper several schemes, and we have agreed to meet our subordinates to-morrow, who will have a number of schemes. It appears to me to be altogether most unwise. The only course at this eleventh hour is to decide on some unanimous line of action which will commend itself to common sense and to the people from whom we have to ask favours, and not to ask for an absurd scheme of pension which would not be sanctioned, or allow the meeting to-morrow to ask for an absurd scheme.

Dr. HETHERINGTON.—We had better discuss the thing generally before going into any special scheme. We have to ascertain whether there is any probability of any scheme whatever being adopted by our own committees. I thought most of the medical superintendents would have consulted their own committees before coming to this meeting, and ascertained the general feeling about adopting any scheme. I did it with my own committee, and found, on the whole, they were rather in favour of having some definite scheme adopted; they said it was unfair that the amount of the pension should be left to the opinion or caprice of a committee. It may happen that when one man comes up for a pension the members of the committee are in a bad humour, and may thus give him very much less than he deserves, while on another occasion they may deal too generously with an applicant. The first thing we should ascertain is whether our committees are really in favour of anything of the sort; otherwise there is not the slightest use in going on. Dr. Harvey's suggestion that there should be a sort of conference between the representatives of the committees and the medical superintendents to see if they can agree on any scheme, or even on the principle of any scheme, leaving the details to be proposed afterwards, should be decided on before we can advance one step. I sent forward a scheme to my friend Dr. Finegan; I did

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not expect to see it on the notice paper. My sole object was that we might have something before us. I do not think any man can expect his scheme, or any scheme, to be adopted as a whole; I think that what Dr. Nolan says is very reasonable. My committee has always, and in a great many cases, dealt liberally, and given up to the full amount that the Act allowed, and seem inclined to do so as far as I can see. For these reasons I would not like to have any scheme adopted without submitting it to my committee. If the committees oppose us I think we could do nothing. We drew up what we thought might be the lines of a scheme. It is quite a different scheme from some of the others I have heard of. I do not think that there is any use in reading it over. We made it permissive as regards some of its provisions; it is merely a matter to bring before you for discussion. It never crossed my mind for a moment that at our proceedings to-morrow on this very important question we could arrive at any definite conclusion. I think that the meeting to-day should spend its time in arriving at some conclusion how to conduct the meeting to-morrow. There are a great many deputations from various asylums, and I am sure some of them will be so sanguine as to want to pass an Act of Parliament to-morrow.

Dr. DONELAN.—The whole matter is a question of expediency. We would all be very glad to have permission changed to certainty, but is there much likelihood of it being done? Outsiders will say, If this change is effected, there must be a certain amount of giving up on our side. With regard to many of the asylums, pensions seem to be dealt with fairly and reasonably, and the same certainly applies to the asylum I am connected with—the Richmond. The important question is, Would we prefer a certainty on a lower scale? Would we thus do better than by leaving things as they are? Dr. Nolan's suggestion is probably the wisest. If we can secure its adoption, we shall be placed in the same position as we were before the Local Government Act came into operation.

Dr. MOORE pointed out the futility of discussing proposals on this occasion, when, as the Division was aware, a meeting of representatives of all the asylum employés in Ireland had been summoned by one of our members to assemble in Dublin next day to discuss the same subject. If we adopt one scheme to-day, what guarantee have we that the majority at to-morrow's meeting will not vote against it?

The PRESIDENT regretted that the matter was brought forward at the present time, which he considered inopportune, but, he said, there is no help for it; the matter has been brought forward, and it is better to discuss it, and, if possible, formulate a scheme. If we go forward as a united body with recommendations to the staffs to-morrow, I think we will go very far to secure the adoption of our views. There are four schemes in the air. There is the scheme proposed by Dr. O'Neill. Dr. Finegan takes up different lines altogether; Dr. Hethrington has another scheme which he has not read to us; and I think an unfortunate proposal is emanating from the Killarney Asylum—the staff of which is already canvassing the members of Parliament to have it carried. In bringing forward any scheme I think we must consider the possibility of carrying it, and my opinion is, it is out of the question to think of getting any pension scheme without unanimity of opinion amongst the Irish members—Nationalists and Unionists. In order that the members of Parliament may take it up, I think we must have the support of our committees of management. Without their support I think we might as well do nothing. If we get their support, and they would approach the local members of Parliament, the latter would probably consent to bring in a Bill which would be practically unopposed, and which I think would pass; otherwise I think our schemes are bound to fail. With regard to what has been done in England, I have here in my hand the confidential report that has been drawn up by the committee formed to consider the pension question in England. I received this letter only this morning, and it shows the enormous difficulty with which this pension question is beset.

Dr. FINEGAN said: My impression is that we can never get assured pensions unless they are on the same basis as the Poor Law Medical Officers' Association, that is, that we should make some small contribution from our salaries towards the pension fund or towards the expenses of the asylum. In Ireland, above all places, there is an outcry against rates. In another few months we will have asylum government more democratic even than the present, and the democratic members

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of our Committee object in the strongest terms to giving pensions to individuals who they consider at the present time are too well off. I have come to the conclusion that neither the members of Parliament nor the local boards throughout the country will support the pension we have been in the habit of getting heretofore. They will not support giving any such pension because they are not given to any other class of officials. You may say that asylum officials are more entitled to it than any other class. I grant you that, but I am an official myself. Other people do not see it in that light; they think we are too well off. Possibly we might be told to join in with the Poor Law Officers' Association, which would be a great misfortune to asylums. I myself am under the impression, if we do adopt anything, that the only one form of pension scheme that we can carry out with any prospect of success is that in which there is a deduction made from the salaries by way of contribution. Some eighteen months ago a very old and efficient official of Mullingar Asylum got phthisis. I reported her to my board as being in the last stages of consumption and unfit for duty. The woman had twenty years' service; she was a most excellent nurse in every sense of the word, in one of the most trusted positions in the house. The committee asked what she was entitled to, and I said £40 a year, and they said, "Preposterous! how can the rates stand that? If we are going to pension all at that rate we will have to come into the asylum ourselves." After a very great appeal from a clerical member not to allow this woman to go into the workhouse after her twenty years' service in the asylum, they at last consented to give her £30 a year, taking 25 per cent. off what she should have got. They then proposed a resolution that this should be the last pension. In the discussion which followed it was stated that it would be very hard that officials of long service should not get pensions, at least in the case of existing officers. At last a compromise was effected in the matter, they saying, "We are agreed to give pensions if the officials themselves make contributions to these pensions, otherwise we will give no pensions." I was directed to draw up a pension scheme and submit it to my board, which I did. It was approved of by my committee, and I was directed to send it round to the other asylums and see what they had got to say, and also to communicate with the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board sent us a communication to the effect that the committee's action in establishing such scheme was altogether *ultra vires*. Then the committee passed a resolution asking the Chief Secretary to legislate so as to enable our own asylum in Mullingar to establish a scheme of this kind.

The Chief Secretary, in replying, said that "fresh legislation would be necessary to legalise any pension scheme such as that submitted by the committee, but that it would not be advisable to legislate on this subject for a particular asylum, as any such legislation should apply to all district asylums. His Excellency is further advised that if legislation could be introduced to grant asylum officials assured instead of permissive pensions, it would be a great boon to a very deserving class of public servants, especially if such a scheme could be arranged with the concurrence of the local authorities. In this connection I am to refer the Joint Committee of Management to the actuary's report on Poor Law officers' superannuation which is being circulated to local bodies."

My committee then decided to ask the other Irish asylums to co-operate with them in establishing some form of pension scheme on a similar basis, that is, making deductions from salaries. Furthermore, my staff, who are particularly anxious for pensions, seeing that the other asylums did not take up the matter, said if the other asylums in Ireland do not wish to take action it is their own loss. I called a meeting of the officials, and they instructed me to get a Bill drawn up by a lawyer and submitted to the Government, to secure permissive legislation if possible for this Mullingar scheme. The Bill is actually being drafted at the present time by a member of Parliament and a lawyer in Dublin. Of course that has to go on in any case, as I have been acting from the beginning not on my own initiative, but on the instructions of my committee and of my staff. By the instructions of my committee I have had to draw up a scheme, and by an instruction from my staff I am getting a Bill introduced. A member of the House of Commons has promised to introduce the Bill when drawn, but he states that it is certain to be opposed. I dare say most of the officials know this scheme. If you bear with me

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for a few minutes, I will just run over the heads of the scheme. First, the officials to be not less than fifty years of age, and to have served no less than fifteen years, excepting in the case of permanent incapacity for duty through illness, when the committee may think fit to grant a pension. Second, on the completion of fifteen years' service, a minimum pension shall be awarded of fifteen thirtieths of the salary and value of allowances, and a maximum of twenty thirtieths on the completion of twenty years' service; one thirtieth of salary and value of allowances to be granted for each year served between fifteen and twenty years' service. Third, any official who may be dismissed by order of the committee of management without the privilege of resigning forfeits all claim to pension or refund of money paid in. Fourth, in the event of any official dying in office all right to a refund of contribution ceases, except in the case of married people, when the committee shall allow the contribution to the relatives of the deceased. Fifth, deductions to be on the scale laid down by the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act of 1896 as follows, viz. officials with less than five years' service, 2 per cent.; officials with more than five years' service and less than ten years' service, 2½ per cent.; officials with more than ten years' service and less than fifteen years' service, 3 per cent. on their salaries and value of allowances. Sixth, all deductions to cease after twenty years' service. This latter is a most important provision, for the simple reason that the majority of men who have got twenty years' service at the present time have nothing to pay. I myself have not a service of twenty years, but have served fifteen, and I shall have to pay for five years; there are others would have to pay for longer; there is a very large majority of the medical officers of the Irish asylums who would have to pay nothing at all because they have served over twenty years. There are several here with twenty years' service, and from that point of view it is extremely good. Seventh, officials resigning voluntarily under five years' service shall forfeit all right to a refund of contributions, except in the case of illness, when the committee may allow a refund of part or the entire of the contribution. Eighth, officials resigning voluntarily after five years' and under ten years' service shall be entitled to a refund of 75 per cent. of the contribution. Ninth, officials resigning voluntarily after ten years' and under fifteen years' service shall be entitled to recover all deductions contributed. This scheme aims not alone at benefiting the officials, but also aims at improving the condition of the asylum service in this way: The course of asylum service as regards officials at present is that those who serve for one, two, three, or four years leave when they are trained and are beginning to be of some use. If the service is less than five years all contributions are forfeited. If he remains for five years he gets back 75 per cent. of his contributions; if he remains for ten he gets the whole of his contributions; and if for fifteen years he gets half his salary and allowances. I think that it is an extremely fair and liberal method. It will also improve the service and make an enormous pension fund—just consider the number of employés coming into the asylums, and the number of changes for the first five years. In Mullingar Asylum sixty-seven of the officials are under five years, eighteen over five, seven over ten, seven over fifteen, and three over twenty years. To bring matters to a head I propose definitely that this scheme of the committee of Mullingar Asylum be accepted as a basis for the pensions of asylum officials generally throughout the country. If the Division would approve of this scheme it would strengthen my hands to go to the members of Parliament and the other asylums to get permissive legislation.

Dr. HARVEY said that since he heard that the scheme had not emanated from the officials, but from the committee of the asylum, he was favourable to it, and would therefore be very glad to withdraw in favour of it.

Dr. O'MARA.—I am quite sure Dr. O'Neill is not in favour of withdrawing his scheme in favour of the Mullingar scheme. I put the Mullingar scheme before the staff, and they would not consider it; they unanimously rejected it. As far as my staff are concerned, they are very badly paid, and they could not offer to contribute anything at all. Some of my female attendants are only paid £9 a year. My committee marked the Mullingar scheme "read," and would not consider the matter any further. That scheme places us in a rather awkward position, inasmuch as it is going before Parliament, embodied in a Bill at present, and any scheme that is propounded by the Association will be rather upset, I think, by Dr.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finegan's scheme. How can we go and ask members of Parliament to support one scheme for Mullingar and another scheme for other asylums? We must go before the meeting to-morrow with some definite scheme from the Association; there is no use going in and saying, "Dr. Finegan has a scheme; Dr. O'Neill has another scheme." I want to have the assured pension under the old rules if I possibly can; even if the time is extended to twenty or twenty-five years I do not object. I am sure Dr. O'Neill would not.

The PRESIDENT.—I think it very important some decision should be come to about this scheme. I do not think there is very much good in putting it before the meeting to-morrow. I believe it will be rejected by ten to one. However, if we approve of it, it should go forward. It is too favourable a good deal to say that any attendant with a salary of £80 a year, if he contributed for twenty years a sum of £1 10s. a year will be absolutely entitled for the rest of his life to a pension. If we commit ourselves to a contribution, when we go forward to Parliament, and it is rejected as inadequate, we shall then be told, "You are in favour of a contribution, now get up a scheme, as the Chief Secretary says, on the lines of the Poor Law officers' scheme." For asylum officials with their arduous work and many risks this would be altogether an insufficient scheme.

Dr. NOLAN.—I am bound to say that the history of the evolution of the Mullingar scheme has been so completely startling that I really feel we are in a much more serious position than before. I merely thought these schemes were on paper for the committee; now I find that actually a Bill for Parliament is being drawn up which we are asked to sanction. It appears to me an easy way of determining; what we ought to do to-morrow is to record definitely our complete disapproval of the Mullingar scheme, and unanimously reject anything of the sort. Now what have we heard from Dr. Finegan? He has told us the history of what happened about the committee and the attendants and the members of Parliament; and the mere fact of his touching the question at all landed him in this grave position, that he actually finds himself now in the hands of a Parliamentary lawyer, who is presumably a Nationalist member of Parliament, and who does not hold out good hopes of even getting the Bill through as it stands. It is appalling to me to think that the members should find themselves in the position of coming here, not with a free hand, but merely to endorse the Mullingar scheme, which is open to so numerous objections that it is absolutely impossible to deal with them. I would hope that at to-morrow's meeting, whatever is done, one resolution should be certainly hostile to the Mullingar scheme, and unanimously refusing to be bound by it in any way.

Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN.—Owing to the unfortunate circumstances of being in court all the morning, and not being able to be present here in the early part of this most valuable discussion, I do not know what is in order for discussion just at present. Is the agenda paper still before the Chair, or are we only discussing the question of Dr. Finegan's scheme? Is the proposal of Dr. O'Neill as it stands on the agenda paper at this meeting still before the Chair?

The PRESIDENT.—Yes.

Dr. NORMAN.—The proposal of Dr. O'Neill appears identical with the proposal introduced by Dr. O'Neill at the meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland held in London on November 21st. In both these documents the Association is requested to urge upon the Government the alteration of the seventh clause of the Pensions Act, 1890, by the introduction of the word "shall" instead of "may." The resolution put before the Medico-Psychological Association in November last was adopted, and you are asked now to reaffirm it. I have read very carefully and repeatedly the Act 53 and 54 Vict., cap. 31,—the Pensions Act of 1890. It has been pointed out to me, and I can endorse it by my own observation, that the Act in question does not contain the word "may," and therefore I beg to submit that we are considering a proposition that has no reference to fact at all, and that we are asked to endorse the action taken in London in November, calling upon the Government to alter an Act by leaving out a word that is not in it, and by substituting the word "shall," which is already there. Was a more pregnant Irish bull ever delivered? With regard to Dr. Finegan's scheme in connection with the proposed rebate out of our incomes to provide a pension fund, I do not see where the fund is to come from. It seems a case somewhat similar to the proposed Poor Law Superannuation Bill, with reference to which the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Government actuary, when called upon to look into it, stated that the scheme would require a fund, money advanced by somebody or other, of at least £10,000 to start the thing. I do not know where we are to get that £10,000 from. Reference has been made to a meeting to be held to-morrow; it has been said at this meeting here to-day that we should adopt some definite formula for to-morrow. I think that is a very bad line of reasoning. The meeting to be held to-morrow was summoned without consultation with this Association. It was summoned by gentlemen who no doubt had the most amiable intentions, but without consultation with anyone, and summoned for the day after this meeting, which was, in my mind, a very grave error. I think that that meeting, supposing it to have been duly authorised, supposing that there was proper authority for convening it at all, should have been summoned for some day which would have given us time to have made up our minds after to-day's discussion, and time to have communicated with the various persons interested, ascertaining their views and finding out how we really stand before taking action. Are we to be told, forsooth, that because without any authority of ours a meeting has been called for to-morrow elsewhere we must therefore make up our minds to-day? Is not this very like bull-dozing this meeting? These matters require very careful consideration. I do not think it competent to any member of this Association, or any individual who happens to be connected with asylums, to go, ring a bell, and call up anybody he likes at any moment he pleases and pass a resolution affecting our gravest interests without any due consideration. I fail to follow the argument addressed to us that we must make up our minds to-day on a matter of importance as to which we are probably quite incapable of deciding on so short notice, in order to present to-morrow a programme to another meeting, when the organisers of that meeting had not the courtesy or common sense to wait until they heard our views before calling themselves together.

Dr. FINEGAN.—I do not like to have Dr. O'Neill condemned wholesale on this point: he is entirely responsible for that meeting; he communicated with me unofficially to say he wished for representatives of all officials of asylums to appear at our Medico-Psychological meeting. I told him that this would be impossible, and that if he wished to have a general meeting of the asylum officials he should convene that meeting himself, that I could have nothing whatever to do with it. Whether he had taken that letter from me as an official sanction from the Association I do not know. I can assure you that is all the authority I have given in the matter. Dr. O'Neill is entirely responsible for his own actions with reference to this second meeting.

Dr. DRAPES.—Several members have said before it is absolutely impossible for this meeting to decide in favour of any particular scheme; the most we can do would be to decide on the principle whether the members are in favour of a scheme involving contributions from the staff or are wholly opposed to it. If the majority are against the scheme which involves contributions, the thing there and then ends. If, on the other hand, they are in favour of some scheme which involves contributions, then it will be time to go into some definite scheme. I regret extremely that the action of Mullingar was so precipitate. Anything adopted here by the medical superintendents should at least have the authority and approval of the Medico-Psychological Association. I think in a thing of this kind that nothing could be done by one asylum, but with the unanimous consent of all asylums and the almost practical consent of the committees something might be done. I still think that if any scheme is going to be adopted, to have any chance of success, there should be a conference between the representatives of the committees as well as the representatives of the asylums. If we can get them to agree on some scheme there is some chance of it passing, otherwise there is not the smallest possibility of success. Dr. Norman alluded with particular point as to where the funds were to come from; if these contributions are an annual aid to paying pensions under that scheme, no fund can be formed whatever unless a certain proportion is set aside to augment every year. We merely pay a certain amount of contributions, but where a fund is to come from I do not think we have heard.

After some further discussion, in which Drs. Mills and Ellison, among others, took part, it was proposed by Dr. NOLAN, seconded by Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN, and adopted:

"That this meeting resolves that at the meeting of the asylum officials to be held on the 19th inst., the action of the members of the Medico-Psychological

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Association present be confined to a suggestion that a representative committee of all classes of asylum officers be formed to consider and report as to the best scheme for superannuation."

Dr. LAWLESS proposed, and Dr. MOORE seconded—"That this meeting does not approve of a contributory scheme for pensions." The resolution was carried on a show of hands.

Dr. Nolan's original notice of motion was then again considered at some length. Finally, Dr. DRAPES moved, and Dr. DONELAN seconded, an amendment thereto in the following terms:

"That Dr. Nolan's resolution with regard to restoring the deleted sections of the Superannuation Act of 1890 be referred to a committee to be appointed to deal with the question of pensions generally, and that if a committee for this purpose be not appointed at to-morrow's conference, a committee of this Association be so appointed."

This amendment was adopted on a division, and being put as a substantive motion was unanimously adopted.

A rather protracted discussion took place (introduced by the President) upon the claim of Dr. Taylor (Medical Superintendent of the Monaghan Asylum) to be assisted to meet the expenses in his action against the Irish Local Government Board, taken with success to compel that body to assess under the Local Government (Ireland) Act the amount of increase in salary due to him for increased duties imposed upon him by the Act. It was recognised that Dr. Taylor's case was a valuable precedent, but as he is not a member of the Association it was felt that the matter should be left rather to the individual discretion of the superintendents than dealt with by the Division.

The proceedings then terminated.

On the same evening fifteen members, including the President, dined together at the Shelbourne Hotel.

A MEDICO-LEGAL CASE.

COMMUNICATED BY SIR JOHN BATTY TUKE.

[The Editors request that members will oblige by sending full newspaper reports of all cases of interest as published by the local press at the time of the Assizes.]

The following curious trial is taken from records of criminal trials before the High Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh, in volume iii of 'Ancient Criminal Trials in Scotland,' compiled from the original records, etc., by Robert Pitcairn. Printed for the Maitland Club, 1833.

"16 Decr. 1561 James Guyld, indicted for Stealing etc. as after specified.

"Mr. Alexander Sym, as prelocutour for James Guyld, beand callit to underlye the law upone his lyff, allegit that he is minor, within the zeiris of xviij their ald, as it may be considerit be inspectione of his face, lyik as he is in deid, and salbe profin gyff neid beis; and thairfoir aucht nocht to underly ane Assyse upone his lyif, nor to thoill jugement thairupone, nother be the Commoune law, nor Municipale law, or use of this realme. And attour the barne him selff is ydiot of natur, nor hes nocht the knawlege to decerne the perrell and the feir of deid; and thairfoir aucht not for to underly ane Assyse, as said is, of lyif: And forder, is subdewit to ane malancolius humour, naturallie descendand from his progenitouris, swa that he is mair desyrus to dee nor to leif, as be experience is notour, the samekill that his fader exponed himselff sindré tymes to the perell of deid, and wald have drowned him selff in the North Loch, wer nocht he wes releved theirfra be nychtbouris; and syclyik Maister Walter Guyld, his fader bruder, occupiit with the same humour, slew him selff in Paris. And thairfoir, the said James, beand bayth minor, and approacheand mair to pupillaritie nor maioritie, and occupiit with the said humour, mair willing to dé nor to leif, and haifand na cuyr of deid, aucht not to underly the law for the lybellit pretendit cryme, etc.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.48.201.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press