PART IV.—NOTES AND NEWS.

THE MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

The Forty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association was held on Monday, 9th August, 1886, in the Rooms of the London Medical Society, Chandos Street, Cavendish Square, Dr. G. H. Savage presiding. Among the members present were Drs. Charles Aldridge, E. M. Courtenay, P. Maury Deas, Edward East, Henry Hicks, O. Jepson, Thomas Lyle, H. Rooke Ley, George Mickley, W. J. Mickle, J. G. McDowall, Donald Mackintosh, John May, John Moloney, Conolly Norman, Frederick Needham, H. Hayes Newington, David Nicolson, Evan Powell, H. Rayner, James Rutherford, James Stewart, R. Percy Smith, G. E. Shuttleworth, Arthur Strange, H. Sutherland, D. Hack Tuke, A. R. Urquhart, E. B. Whitcombe, T. Outterson Wood, &c.

At the opening of the proceedings Dr. RAYNER, who at first occupied the chair, referred to the mournful circumstance which rendered it necessary for him thus to take the place of the outgoing President, saying that none of the members who saw Dr. Eames at the last annual meeting at Cork, and subsequently at the Belgian Congress, would have anticipated that he would so soon have been called away. He felt sure that all present would unite in an expression of regret at the loss of a fellow-member so well known and respected, while to those who knew him intimately the feeling would be one of very deep sorrow. Dr. Eames' generous qualities, public spirit, and liberal and kindly interest in his work had earned for him the highest esteem. He would say no more on the subject at present, as one of the first proceedings of the business of the day would be to move a vote of sympathy and condolence with Dr. Eames' family. It now remained for him only to instal Dr. Savage in the Presidential chair. That chair had been occupied by many worthy and distinguished men, but by none more worthy and distinguished, intellectually and socially, than Dr. Savage. He (Dr. Rayner) had few greater sources of pride and pleasure than that of possessing Dr. Savage's friendship, and it therefore gave him the greatest possible gratification to now offer him the chair, which was the highest honour their Association could confer.

Dr. SAVAGE, in taking the chair, said that his first impulse was to join with the members in lamenting the death of Dr. Eames, who had so unexpectedly and sadly passed away in the full vigour of manhood. Full of purpose, zealous at his work, and possessing qualities which had endeared him to all who knew him, the loss was, indeed, a grievous one. He also felt it right here to refer to the work which had been thrown upon their Secretary, Dr. Rayner, who, in addition to other heavy duties, had had to take charge of at least two Bills. Sittings of the Parliamentary Committee had been constantly held, and the way in which Dr. Rayner had done his work throughout left nothing to be desired. He (Dr. Savage), now begged to thank the Association for the honour they had conferred upon him, and to express the hope that his year of office would be as successful as those of his immediate predecessors.

The GENERAL SECRETARY submitted the minutes of the last annual meeting, which were printed in Vol xxxi., No. 135, of this Journal (October, 1885).

The minutes, having been taken as read, were confirmed.

Dr. COURTENAY then proposed the following motion:—

> That this Association conveys to Mrs. Eames its deep sympathy in the loss she has so recently and unexpectedly sustained, and expresses to her the high esteem and honor in which our late President, Dr. Eames, was held, as a result of his philanthropic exertions for the welfare of the insane and of his social and intellectual worth.

He would only add that in Ireland Dr. Eames's loss was considered a very grievous one to the Association.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dr. NEEDHAM seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously, Dr. Courtenay undertaking to communicate it to the family of Dr. Eames.

The TREASURER, Dr. Paul, submitted the balance-sheet of the accounts for the past year, which will be found on the next page, the same having been duly examined and certified as correct. (See p. 450.)

On the motion of Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN the balance-sheet was adopted, and a vote of thanks was conveyed to Dr. Paul, which was suitably responded to by him.

Dr. CLOUSTON proposed a vote of thanks to the editors of the Journal, observing that the editing of the Journal, which was, undoubtedly, one of the most important works in connection with the Association, and required a great amount of care, had been remarkably well carried on during the past year. He had only one suggestion to make, which was, that the editorial staff might some day be strengthened, and perhaps put on a broader basis by the addition of a provincial man.

Dr. DEAS seconded the motion, which was carried.

Dr. HACK TUKE said that it gave Dr. Savage and himself much pleasure to receive this recognition of their work, especially coming from Dr. Clouston, who so well knew the duties of editorship—he might say the pains as well as the pleasures of the post. The editors were always extremely glad to receive any hints, either from former editors or other members of the Association, and had frequently adopted them. He hoped that the Journal carried out what was the original aim and object of its establishment as mentioned at the time it was established, viz., that it should be a means of communication between superintendents of asylums and those who were engaged in any way in lunacy work, the expression used being that nothing should be excluded from its pages which was not opposed to the modern system of the treatment of the insane.

Dr. NEEDHAM proposed a vote of thanks to the Secretaries, saying that it must be obvious that the success of a large Association such as theirs depended to a great extent upon the energy and ability displayed by their Secretaries.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. RAYNER, General Secretary, in response, said that his duties had always been a source of great pleasure to him. He was beginning to feel that he ought really to make way for a younger and more active man, but for some six or seven years he had been led on by the hope of seeing a Lunacy Bill passed. He still hoped for this, and would accordingly continue for the present to do all he could to further the interests of the Association.

Dr. RUTHERFORD said that last year at the annual meeting in Cork he tendered his resignation of the Secretaryship for Scotland, but as there was no other Scotch member present it was thought better to postpone consideration of the subject till the views of the Scotch members were known as to who should be his successor. He, therefore, begged now to resign the office, which he could not do without feelings akin to regret, but having been Secretary for ten years he thought it was time that some younger m mber should be called upon to take the work in hand. He hoped that his successor would at the end of his Secretaryship have as many pleasant recollections as he had.

Dr. COURTENAY, Secretary for Ireland, also suitably acknowledged the vote of thanks.

The PRESIDENT said that the business now to be dealt with was the appointment of officers and Council for the ensuing year. He explained the mode of voting, and nominated Dr. Paul and Dr. Nicolson as scrutineers. Dr. Rutherford having definitely made up his mind to resign, that gentleman was, no doubt, prepared to propose someone to succeed him, and as Dr. Rutherford knew the work so well, his nominee would be accepted with confidence. Among new members of the Council the name of Dr. S. Mitchell had at first been submitted, but on his declining to serve, and it being considered that the assistant medical officers, that very large, important, and rising class of the Association, should be represented, the name of Dr. J. G. McDowall was inserted, he also coming from the North of England.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

The Treasurer's Annual Balance Sheet, 1885-86.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.
To Balance—Cash in Hand	234	15	1
To Subscriptions received	253	11	0
By Secretary for Ireland	31	10	0
By Secretary for Scotland	35	14	0
By Sale of Journal	151	16	0
By Interest on £205 7s. 10d. 3 per cent. Consols	5	19	2
	£713	5	3

EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
By Annual, Special, and Quarterly Meetings ...	16	5	10
By Expenses of Reporting at various Meetings ...	12	9	0
By Editorial Expenses	12	12	0
Printing, publishing, engraving, advertising expenses, and postage of Journal ...	420	8	1
Prize—Dr. Greenlees	10	10	0
By Sundry Expenses, Printing, &c.	11	2	8
By Treasurer	6	6	0
By Secretary for Ireland	2	14	7
By Secretary for Scotland	5	5	0
By General Secretary	2	16	6
By purchase of £100 12s. 2d. 3 per cent. Consols ...	101	19	11
By Balance in Treasurer's hands	110	15	8
	£713	5	3

Examined and found correct,

FRED. NEEDHAM
H. HAYES NEWINGTON, } Auditors.

Bethlem Royal Hospital,
August 7th, 1886.

J. H. PAUL,
TREASURER.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dr. RUTHERFORD said that he had great pleausure in proposing that Dr. rquhart, Medical Superintendent, Murray's Royal Ayslum, Perth, should be ected Honorary Secretary for Scotland. He knew that this appointment ould be gratifying to the great majority of the members in Scotland as well as the whole Association. Dr. Urquhart's ability and fitness were too well iown to require any comment.

Dr. CLOUSTON cordially seconded this, saying that the Scotch members were greed as to Dr. Urquhart's fitness for the appointment.

The lists were then collected, and the scrutineers retired to examine them, bsequently reporting that the nominations of the Council had been unanimously supported, whereupon the following gentlemen were declared by the RESIDENT to be duly elected as

OFFICERS AND OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL OF THE MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

YEAR 1886-7.

PRESIDENT-ELECT	F. NEEDHAM, M.D.
TREASURER	JOHN H. PAUL, M.D.
EDITORS OF JOURNAL...	D. HACK TUKE, M.D. G. H. SAVAGE, M.D.
AUDITOR	J. T. HINGSTON, M.R.C.S.
HONORARY SECRETARIES	H. RAYNER, M.D. General Secretary. A. R. URQUHART, M.B. For Scotland. E. M. COURTENAY, M.B. For Ireland.

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

J. G. MCDOWALL, M.B.	G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH, M.D.
H. T. PRINGLE, M.D.	H. SUTHERLAND, M.D.

The election of ordinary members was then proceeded with. The balloting x having been sent round, and there being no dissentient vote, the list was ken *en masse*, and the following gentlemen were declared to have been duly ected ordinary members, viz:—James Vernon McCreery, L.R.C.S.I., Medical perintendent, Kew Lunatic Asylum, Melbourne; William L. Ruxton, M.B., M., South Yorkshire Asylum, Wadsley, Sheffield; A. L. Fullarton Robertson, B., C.M.Ed., St. Andrew's, Billing Road, Northampton; G. Fletcher Collins, R.C.S.E., &c., County Asylum, Knowle, Fareham, Hants; R. Leonard itherford, M.D., Medical Superintendent, City Asylum, Digby's, near Exeter. H. Myddelton-Gavey, M.R.C.S. and L.S.A., Camberwell House, S.E.; R. B. dd Stephenson, M.B. and C.M., District Asylum, Perth; A. C. Suffern, M.D., rmingham Borough Asylum.

Dr. HACK TUKE moved the election, as Honorary Members, of M. Théophile ussel, M.D., Paris, Sénateur; Dr. J. N. Ramaer, Haarlem, Inspector of Asylums; d Dr. Godding, Medical Superintendent of the Government Hospital for the sane, Washington; and as Corresponding Members, of M. Jules Morel, M.D., ent; and M. Victor Parant, M.D., Toulouse. Dr. Hack Tuke explained that . Roussel was the proposer and also the reporter of the Committee recently it by the French Senate to inquire as to the state of the lunacy laws in England. In that capacity he was seen by many members of the Association, and o large and important volumes had since been issued embodying the results the Committee's inquiries. He was also known as an original author. As to . Ramaer, several members present had met him recently in Antwerp, where had been one of the honorary presidents of the Congress of Psychiatry. He s formerly Superintendent of the Zutphen Asylum, and subsequently Presit of the Dutch Psychological Association, being afterwards made Inspector Asylums in Holland. He had been also for many years an honorary member

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the Medico-Psychological Association in Paris. Dr. Godding was the Medical Superintendent of the Government Asylum for the Insane at Washington, and was a leading man in our specialty in the States. There was a special appropriateness in his case in connection with the coming Congress in Washington, at which their President was anticipating being present. As regards the Corresponding Members, Dr. Jules Morel had been known to many of them, and had been most courteous to those who, like himself, had attended the Antwerp Congress. For many years he had been connected with an institution for the insane in Ghent, and was President of the Society there. He had written many papers and articles. He was now in charge temporarily of the Guislain Asylum at Ghent, in consequence of the death of Dr. Ingels, and he (Dr. Tuke) expected that he would ultimately be promoted to the superintendency. Dr. Parant, who was a nephew of the well-known Dr. Foville, was head of an institution for the insane at Toulouse. He was an able contributor to "L'Encéphale" and the "Annales Médico-Psychologiques." One article was especially valuable, viz., that on the Simulation of Insanity, published not long ago, and analysed in the "Journal of Mental Science."

Dr. NICOLSON supported the motion, saying that he had had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Roussel at Broadmoor at the time referred to by Dr. Tuke.

Dr. CLOUSTON confirmed what Dr. Tuke had said as to the standing and acquirements of Dr. Roussel and also of Dr. Godding The report of the former to the French Senate was a most valuable and instructive document.

The names having been taken *en masse*, the gentlemen referred to were declared to be duly elected.

Upon the question of the time and place of the next annual meeting, the PRESIDENT remarked that probably some of the members might be going to the International Medical Congress in America in September, 1887, and it would be desirable that the annual meeting of the Association should be held before they would have to start.

Dr. RAYNER thought that, on the whole, a meeting earlier in the year than the present one would be advantageous, as by meeting late they lost the use of the rooms of the Royal College of Physicians and the attendance of several London members who started early for their holidays.

Dr. URQUHART suggested that the annual meeting should be held at the end of May in future. It had been formerly agreed that the meeting should be held as near as possible to the time of that of the British Medical Association, but it was also understood that it was not to be an appendix to it, and when, as on the present occasion, the two meetings were held in different places, most Scotch members would prefer to come to the Metropolis in May, when there would be more doing and to be seen.

Dr. JEPSON thought the time of the meeting would be best left to the Secretary or President to decide upon.

The PRESIDENT said that Dr. Urquhart was taking it for granted that the meeting would be held in London

Dr. HACK TUKE suggested that the views of President elect as to the time and place of meeting next year should be solicited.

Dr. NEEDHAM said that, as far as he was concerned, the matter was entirely in the hands of the members of the Association.

Dr. TUKE said that in that case, and subject entirely to Dr. Needham's feeling in the matter, he would propose that the next annual meeting should be held at Gloucester. It would be very interesting to meet where Dr. Needham carried on his asylum work, and it might also be remembered that the proposal to form this Association originally sprang from Gloucester in 1840, when Dr. Hitch was Superintendent of the County Asylum.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said that he was sure provincial members would be much pleased if the annual meeting were held in some other city or town than London. He should be very glad if Birmingham were selected.

Dr. DEAS thought the Association would gain by meeting, as on the present

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

occasion, on the day before the meeting of the British Medical Association, and at the same place.

Dr. RAYNER referred to the 4th Section of the Rules, and said that of course any proposition in regard to the day of meeting would be taken into consideration by the Council.

Dr. CLOUSTON said it seemed to him that every practical consideration went in the direction of meeting in London or Edinburgh. He, for one, would be most happy to go to Gloucester; but they ought to carefully consider before going to a provincial centre. Old members years ago used to say that in provincial centres the meetings became slower, and the vitality of the Association suffered.

Dr. DEAS said that, on the contrary, one of the very best annual meetings was held at York, and a most successful one was held at Glasgow.

Dr. NICOLSON remarked that the meeting at York was in connection with that of the British Medical Association at Leeds. It would be well to select some place which would attract members who had not previously been present, otherwise their object in going to a provincial town failed.

Dr. DEAS said he was ready to propose that if, as was probable, the meeting of the British Medical Association were next year held at Leeds, the Medico-Psychological Association should meet there too. They would probably thus gain the attendance of many members who could not come to the metropolis. If the British Medical Association should not meet at Leeds, then it might be left to the discretion of the Council.

Dr. NEEDHAM said that although he had no definite choice between Gloucester and London, he should have a distinct objection to another provincial town being substituted for Gloucester.

Dr. HAYES NEWINGTON urged that the convenience of the President elect (Dr. Needham) ought to be consulted.

Dr. Hack Tuke's proposal that the next annual meeting should be held at Gloucester having been duly seconded,

Dr. JEPSON moved an amendment, which was seconded, "That the next annual meeting be held in London."

The amendment having been put to the vote, there appeared: For the amendment, 11; against the amendment, 8. The original motion was then put to the vote and rejected, there being 8 votes in its favour and 11 against it. It was therefore agreed that the next annual meeting should be held in London.

Some further discussion having arisen in regard to the date of the annual meeting and the rule of the Association relating thereto,

Dr. HAYES NEWINGTON said that he thought the better way would be for members having suggestions to make on the subject to address them to the Council.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council would, of course, be prepared to receive recommendations. They would also like to know what would best suit the convenience of the Scotch and Irish members.

Dr. RUTHERFORD said he was sure that the months of May or June would suit the Scotch members best.

Dr. URQUHART said it would place him in a very difficult position if there were no definite agreement come to as to the date of the annual meeting, and he would have to give notice of motion to have the rule bearing on the subject amended. The question had come up frequently before, and the result had not been satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT: Then am I to take this as a notice for an alteration of the rule?

Dr. URQUHART: Yes; unless some means are taken for making the meeting earlier.

With reference to the Parliamentary Committee, Dr. RAYNER reported that meetings had been held on seven occasions, on one occasion lasting all day. The Committee's recommendations had apparently been very favourably re-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ceived by the Lord Chancellor, as a great number of alterations in the Bill followed closely the suggestions which were sent. Many members of the Committee attended most regularly, some from a considerable distance. He then read the names of the members at present comprising the Committee.

A MEMBER said that if it were proposed to add to the Committee he would like to suggest the name of Dr. McDowall, of the Morpeth Asylum.

Dr. NICOLSON thought the present Committee was large enough, and moved that it should be reappointed *en masse* as it stood, and that a vote of thanks should be accorded to the members for their past work.

Dr. T. OUTTERSON WOOD seconded this, and the Parliamentary Committee was then reappointed accordingly.

Dr. RAYNER reported that a scheme was about to be sanctioned by the Charity Commissioners for the administration of the Elliott Charity, the principal provisions of the scheme being as follows:—

THE ELLIOTT CHARITY.

The Charity, to be entitled "The Elliott Charity," to be administered and managed by five trustees, two being *ex-officio* trustees and three co-optative. The *ex-officio* trustees to be the Secretary to the Lunacy Commissioners and the Treasurer of the Medico-Psychological Association. The co-optative trustees to be competent persons residing in England or Wales, but having no interest in any house licensed for the reception of lunatics under the Statute 8 and 9 Vict., c. 100, or any modification or re-enactment thereof. The trustees to meet once a year or oftener, and to keep minutes of their proceedings and books of account. The income of the Charity to be applied for the benefit of such poor persons, whether male or female, as shall have been employed as attendants upon the insane in any house licensed for the reception of lunatics under the Statute 8 and 9 Vict., c. 100, or any statutory modification or re-enactment thereof for the time being in force, and as shall, whilst so employed, have become incapacitated by sickness, accident, old age, or other infirmity, from continuing in such employment.

The term "attendant," as used in this scheme, to mean any person, whether male or female, employed, either wholly or partially, in the personal care, control, or management of any lunatic.

No person to be qualified to become, or continue, a recipient of the benefits of the Charity who, or (if a female) whose husband, shall be in receipt of an income exceeding an amount to be decided upon. The recipients of the Charity to be selected and appointed by the trustees from applicants having the prescribed qualifications; but the trustees, when and so far as practicable, to make it a condition of granting relief, that some payment or contribution towards the support, or for the benefit, of the person relieved, be made, or agreed to be made, either by such person, or by his or her relations or friends.

The clear yearly income of the Charity, after outgoings and expenses, to be applied for the benefit of persons selected by placing, or assisting to place, them, either temporarily or permanently, in some institution for the reception of convalescent or incurable patients, or in an ordinary or special hospital or infirmary, or other institution suited to the circumstances of the particular case, or by the supply of medical or other aid in sickness, or of clothes, linen, bedding, fuel, tools, food, or other articles in kind for the use of sick or infirm persons at their own homes or elsewhere; or, if the trustees shall think fit, by gifts or donations of money, or by the grant of pensions not exceeding £30 per annum to any one person, no pension being continued for more than three years without investigation and renewal.

The trustees of the Charity to make all necessary arrangements with governing bodies of institutions for the reception of poor nominees, and for the exercise of due supervision over them, and to transact all other business in connection with the scheme.

Dr. CLOUSTON suggested that counsel's opinion might be taken to ascertain whether all asylums receiving private patients might not come within the operation of the trust.

The PRESIDENT said that he would take it as a suggestion to the Council.

The action of the Council in regard to the matter was then approved.

Dr. HACK TUKE said that the Council had received, through Mr. Wilkes, one of the executors of the late Mr. Gaskell, an offer which they had gladly accepted, to place the interest of £1,000 permanently at the disposal of the Association for some useful object, which would at the same time serve to connect the name of Mr. Gaskell with the Association of which he was so distinguished a member. The gift was in reality made by Mrs. Holland, of London, the sister of the deceased. In the last circular issued respecting the examination in psychological medicine, it was stated that it was in contemplation to have an additional examination for honours, and the Council considered

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that this sum would come in very usefully towards providing a "Gaskell prize" in connection with that examination. It was proposed to apply it, therefore, for this purpose, subject to Mrs. Holland's approval.

Dr. RAYNER said that the Council were of opinion that the sum in question should be accepted and applied to the purpose mentioned by Dr. Tuke.

As regards the examinations for the certificate of competency in psychological medicine, the Council had come to the conclusion that the regulations had been too stringent, and had excluded many who might otherwise have suitably applied for the diploma. It was, therefore, proposed that the examinations should be more widely opened, and that having attained the age of 21, with the possession of a diploma admitting to registration, should constitute eligibility for examination, together with such experience in lunacy matters as might satisfy the President for the year.

Dr. URQUHART said he was pleased to hear that the Council had done this. In Scotland men would not come forward on account of the stringent regulations now in force.

Dr. NEEDHAM begged to suggest that in accepting Mrs. Holland's gift on behalf of her late brother, the Association should express their great regret at the death of Mr. Gaskell, who was one of the most energetic of the Lunacy Commissioners. Mr. Gaskell had encouraged young superintendents, and his advice had been of the greatest possible benefit. He (Dr. Needham) personally felt much gratitude for the encouragement he had had from Mr. Gaskell.

Dr. JEPSON seconded the proposal of Dr. Needham, referring to his own pleasant remembrance of the late Mr. Gaskell.

Dr. CLOUSTON suggested that candidates might be allowed to come up for examination before receiving their diplomas under the Medical Acts, the actual bestowal of the medico-psychological certificate being deferred till after registration. Many students who were cramming for their medical examinations would be glad to be able to pass this examination at the same time. After receiving their degrees they might be going away all over the world, and would not be in a condition to subsequently pass. It would be desirable to catch them just at the right time.

Dr. DEAS said that it would never do for the Association to give a diploma until the student had actually registered. He would support Dr. Clouston's proposal if the diploma were thus withheld.

Dr. STRANGE, referring to Dr. Rayner's explanation of the Council's proposals as to the required experience in lunacy matters, thought that the power of deciding on the sufficiency of that experience should be exercised by the President and Council, and not by the President alone.

Dr. RAYNER said he had proposed that the duty should be imposed on the President and not on the examiners, in order to avoid any suspicion of bias. As the sense of the Council was that the restrictions in regard to opportunities of experience should be as slight as possible, the President's duty in that respect would not be very difficult.

It was then agreed that the examination for the certificate of competency should be open to medical men, whether students or not, if of age; that there should be no restriction as to their being qualified before going up for examination, but that the diploma should not be given until they were actually registered.

Dr. HACK TUKE said it should be clearly understood in regard to the relaxation of the conditions that, although the latter would be no longer insisted upon, they would be preferred, and that the decision of the President whether the antecedents of candidates were sufficient would be an alternative condition. The second rule would now, therefore, end thus:—"*or* they shall give such proofs of experience in lunacy as shall, in the opinion of the President, be sufficient," or words to that effect.

The PRESIDENT said that one difficulty had arisen from finding that men

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would apply who had had much practical experience in dealing with lunacy, but who had never been in asylums or attended courses of lectures. For instance, there were many in Workhouse infirmaries who saw a great deal of lunacy. It would be a very easy thing for the President to see that such a person had been for a long time in an infirmary, and was, therefore, qualified in that way to enter for his examination. He was inclined to think that there was a great future before this diploma question. If they could once get a start and let it be known that it was a very important qualification, there was little doubt that a Lord Chancellor would sooner or later take it up, and give the diploma official recognition in a Lunacy Bill. It had been under the consideration of the Council whether some regulation might be framed by which all who held the appointment of medical superintendent of asylums for the insane at the present time might receive the qualification at a very small cost. It would then be for the superintendents to see that their assistant medical officers took the qualification, so that the whole thing might thus be well initiated.

This having been agreed to, the Association proceeded with the appointment of examiners for the ensuing year.

Dr. RAYNER proposed that Dr. Hack Tuke and Dr. Savage should be the examiners for England for the current year.

Dr. URQUHART proposed an alteration in regard to the Scotch examiners for the ensuing year. He was sorry to say that there had been no application for the certificate from Scotland. As far as he could understand, from conversing with assistant medical officers, this was owing partly to the restrictions, and partly to the fee being fixed too high. He should be sorry to see Drs. Howden and Ireland superseded, but he thought that one of their teachers and one of the superintendents who was not a teacher should be appointed on the board of examiners, and he therefore moved that Dr. Clouston and Dr. Rutherford should be appointed for the ensuing year.

It was then resolved that the examiners for 1886-7 should be:—

For England ...	...	Dr. Savage and Dr. Hack Tuke.
For Ireland ...	...	Dr. C. Norman and Dr. Ringrose Atkins.
For Scotland...	...	Dr. Clouston and Dr. Rutherford.

Upon the motion of Dr. CLOUSTON, the amount of the fee for the examination was reduced from five to three guineas.

The PRESIDENT submitted a letter addressed to him by Dr. Campbell, of the Garlands Asylum, enclosing a copy of the correspondence with the Commissioners in Lunacy and a proposed draft clause to be inserted in any future Lunacy Amendment Act, with the object of insuring the due removal from lunatic patients, previous to admission, of articles likely to cause injury to themselves or others.

The foregoing communication was referred to the Parliamentary Committee.

AFTERNOON MEETING.

The PRESIDENT read his address, which will be found at p. 313 of this Journal.

Dr. CLOUSTON said he was sure all present would cordially agree with him in a very hearty vote of thanks to the President for his address. He had heard a great many addresses from that chair, but he had never heard an address more carefully prepared or more honestly and fairly stated, nor one more calculated to be suggestive to their minds and helpful to them in their daily work as physicians to the insane. In some respects the address had produced what was perhaps the best effect—not agreement, but mental criticism; that was, it had suggested to them other facts and other views of the subject than those laid down in the address. In regard, for instance, to the President's deprecation of the attempts to classify insanity into various groups, they could not fail to notice that Dr. Savage, after having condemned these attempts, turned round and classified several groups of insanity in the most careful way. After

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reproving sin, he himself became the sinner. However, at present they had got to observe facts and reason on them, and they could not take a better example than their President had set them. Dr. Savage had honestly looked at the productions of others, and had endeavoured to get a new light from what he had seen, and that was the right thing to do. The greatest compliment they could pay Dr. Savage was to imitate his state of mind and to do as he had done, looking carefully into the state of disease and striving to make the very best classifications they could. One of their great difficulties was that they were not dealing with an organ regulated from elsewhere, but with an organ regulating itself, being its own vaso-motor centre, and representing and controlling the functions of every organ of the body. He was not quite sure that he should divide the different classifications as Dr. Savage had done. As regards the functional cases and cases depending upon worry, &c., he was not certain that the division was real. The fact was that in the functional cases they simply could not lay their hands upon the particular kind of disturbance present, but in the other cases they could lay their hands upon it. In regard to what Dr. Savage termed functional cases, the question occurred to him whether he could have cured them if he had commenced on the day of admission, before the medical treatment had taken place, or whether, after all, reason did not cure the cases mentioned by Dr. Savage when the disease had expended itself. In conclusion, he felt sure they would join with him in according to Dr. Savage a very hearty vote of thanks for his address.

Dr. C. NORMAN seconded the vote of thanks, saying that Dr. Savage's excellent and well-reasoned address would be better criticized by the members when it appeared in print.

The motion was then put to the meeting by Dr. RAYNER, and carried with applause.

The PRESIDENT thanked the Association for the vote of thanks. He said that he had constantly in his mind a saying of Dr. Gull, that "definition was of the devil." Perhaps he had been somewhat biassed in that way, but it was so easy to acquire fixed notions. As a student he remembered how this was brought about, even by the simple fact that one of their old teachers use to treat pneumonia with "acetate of ammonia, one ounce." The students had got the name of a certain disease, the name of a doctor, and the designation of a remedy, and the result was this fixed association of ideas. Instead of being too ready to crystallize, he felt that they should keep themselves, so to speak, in as saturated a solution as possible.

Dr. HACK TUKE said they were all agreed that the spider's web which the President had woven for them would have the effect of destroying a good many mischievous and irritating flies coming within Dr. Savage's description of "the cramping influence of forms," which influence was, no doubt, very injurious in their department of medical science, as indeed it was in all others. The address should be taken as a whole, otherwise its author would be unfairly judged. If isolated parts were taken, they might be rather disheartening to a student of insanity, and might infuse into his mind a kind of psychological agnosticism which would damp his ardour, whereas, if he took the whole of the address, he would balance what might a little discourage him with the wide field of inquiry Dr. Savage opened up to them. Of the three divisions referred to, the third was the most interesting to him, and, as he thought, the most important, viz., that division in which Dr. Savage spoke specially of functional disorders, and in which he had given his sanction to the use of the term "functional" in the sense in which he had described it. He thought the idea conveyed in the popular term "mental de-rangement" very aptly expressed it. That was to say, just as in delirium it was the plough going in the wrong direction—out of the straight line—so in this third division it was a derangement of the various factors—mental conditions—instead of what they understood as an organic or structural disease. He thought it most important to bear this in mind both in regard to treatment and prognosis. Some twenty

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

years ago he contributed an article, "Artificial Insanity in Relation to Mental Pathology," in which he endeavoured to show that, under certain hypnotic conditions, all the delusions and hallucinations with which they were familiar in the insane could be produced and dissipated at will, and he had urged the important bearing of these facts upon functional mental disorders. All that Dr. Savage had advanced went to prove that some morbid mental disorders might be removed by what he had spoken of as reason or some other moral influence. This seemed very surprising, but the surprise would be lessened if the hypnotic facts he had mentioned were realized. He thought the effect of the admirable address they had listened to would be very largely useful in this direction. Again, the remark which Dr. Savage made in regard to various mental expressions being associated with precisely the same condition of brain was put very clearly and instructively. The whole of the address, philosophical as it was, and broad in all its directions, would have a most wholesome influence upon the views held in regard to the pathology of insanity.

The PRESIDENT referred to a paper* in the hands of Dr. Courtenay inviting contributions from members of the Association to a fund which it was proposed to raise for the benefit of the widow and family of the late Dr. Eames under the circumstances therein explained, and said that he believed it would meet with the approval of the members if the sum of ten guineas were voted thereto from the funds of the Association.

Dr. PAUL, as treasurer, seconded this proposal, remarking that he was glad that their funds would permit of it, and that it would also show the very kindly feeling which they entertained towards their Irish friends.

The proposition was unanimously agreed to, and the proceedings terminated.

FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

Held at Brighton August 10th-13th, 1886.†

The following brief summary of the Section on Psychology is from the report in the "British Medical Journal," Aug. 28. Notes of the discussions are in the hands of the Editor of that Journal, and will appear in its pages. For permission to publish the papers read at Brighton we are indebted to Mr. Hart's usual courtesy.

President: T. S. Clouston, M.D. *Vice-Presidents:* C. A. Lockhart Robertson, M.D.; J. R. Gasquet, M.B. *Secretaries:* C. S. W. Cobbold, M.D.; J. M. Moody, M.R.C.S.

Wednesday, August 11th.

The PRESIDENT delivered an address, which was published at page 319 of the Journal for August 14th.

Dr. A. CAMPBELL CLARK read a paper on Experimental Dietetics in Lunacy Practice: a Record of Investigations and Results. The paper was illustrated by printed tables. A discussion followed, in which the President, Dr. J. A. Campbell, Dr. G. H. Savage, Dr. Needham, Dr. Deas, and Dr. Chapman took part; and Dr. Campbell Clark replied.

Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH read a paper on the Relation of Marriages of Consanguinity to Mental Unsoundness, on which remarks were made by Dr. Ball (Paris), Dr. Langdon Down, Dr. Fletcher Beach, and Dr. Hack Tuke.

* Obituary of Dr. Eames. † See Occasional Notes of the Quarter.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.32.139.448 Published online by Cambridge University Press