THE
BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY
(THE JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE)
[*Published by Authority of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association*]

SUPPLEMENT, MARCH 1966

THE ROYAL MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ADJOURNED ANNUAL MEETING

AN ADJOURNED ANNUAL MEETING was held at the Royal Society of Medicine, 1 Wimpole Street, London, W.1, on Saturday, 20 November, 1965.

Professor T. Ferguson Rodger, the President, was in the Chair.

The General Secretary, Dr. A. B. Monro, opened the proceedings, suggesting that the most urgent matter was the approval of the proposed revised Bye-Laws, since these had to be submitted to the Privy Council, who might need to consider them for several months. Other items on the Agenda were not so urgent, as they did not need to be presented to the Privy Council. He suggested that the Bye-Laws should be considered first, and that the other items on the Agenda could be dealt with if there was time, or otherwise referred to another meeting.

The General Secretary stated that certain matters had been referred to learned Counsel for advice, in particular a suggested amendment to the Charter to remove the present limitation on the annual value of property which may be held by the Association; Bye-Laws referring to removal from the Register; the privileges of Ordinary and Associate Members; and the proposals concerning members' subscriptions and the signature of cheques on behalf of the Association.

He also enumerated various points which had arisen since the draft proposed Bye-Laws had been circulated:

"(1) Following the letter in last week's *British Medical Journal*, a discussion has taken place on the length of time which must elapse before a Foundation Collegiate Member becomes a Fellow. By implication the period in the documents circulated is ten years. Council unanimously recommend that this period be reduced to five years. (Some anomaly regarding the time at which Fellowship follows on Foundation Collegiate Membership is inevitable. Either some deserving people may get it too late, or some young members may get it too early. Council have decided that it is better to have the anomaly of some people getting it too early than to have the converse one.) This of course may be queried by the Privy Council.

(2) The suggestion in the same letter that the proposed Collegiate structure would perpetuate a condition of oligarchy was completely rejected by Council. It is estimated that the electorate will consist of some 700 Foundation Fellows and Collegiate Members, all of whom will have considerable powers of nomination.

(3) The point was raised about the position of the fairly senior Senior Registrar who might have acquired such qualifications as would lead him to expect consultant status in the near future. It was felt that some of these senior Senior Registrars might prefer to obtain the qualification by examination, as in, say, 20 years' time it might be an advantage to them to be able to state that they had obtained the qualification by examination rather than through the Foundation machinery. Nevertheless, it was felt that the door should be left rather wider open to them to apply for Foundation Membership if they so wished. This would not imply any lowering of standard of the qualification. It would be arranging for wider possibilities for application to be made to the Court of Electors. Council recommended that this could be done by amending the proposed Council Resolutions as follows:

Paragraph 12, Sub-paragraph (IV)(d)(2nd last page). The third sentence to read as follows:

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125066307779 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'This clause is intended to enable the Court of Electors to consider for the Fellowship those who, have been Consultants for *less than* five years, *and to consider for Foundation Collegiate Membership those who feel that their cases, though not covered by the present rules, merit consideration. In respect of admission to Foundation Collegiate Membership or Fellowship the Inception Procedure shall remain in force for five years, i.e., appeals under this Section may be lodged at any time up to five years after the inception date.*'

There must then be a consequential amendment to Section (f) at the bottom of the page, where 'three years' must be amended to 'five years'.

(4) Corresponding Fellows. An enquiry has been received regarding the status of Corresponding Members (in future Corresponding Fellows), particularly in Commonwealth countries. Council recommend that it should be made quite clear that Corresponding Fellowship would not entitle the holder to use the title of Fellow in self-description as a holder of the Association's qualification. If any Corresponding Fellow wished to possess the Fellowship and this information was placed before the Court of Electors, they would, of course, be free to invite the Corresponding Fellow to apply for Fellowship. It is very unlikely that Corresponding Fellowship would be conferred upon any individual whose qualifications were not adequate for the full Fellowship. This could be a means of creating a nucleus of Corresponding Fellows, particularly in Commonwealth countries.

(5) The phrase in the Summary of the Recommendations for a Collegiate Structure regarding Ordinary Membership is misleading, particularly the word 'restricted' in line 2. This is not meant to imply that those who are Ordinary Members at the time of inception, but have not the necessary experience in psychiatry, will be excluded. They will continue to be Ordinary Members if they so wish, but all Ordinary Members admitted in future will be required to have the necessary experience. We have been strongly advised that as we aspire to become a Royal College of Psychiatrists, Ordinary Membership must be limited to those practising the specialty. If we do not have some such provision this will prejudice our petition's chances.

(6) Associate Membership should remain open to doctors who have not the experience in psychiatry necessary to become Ordinary Members. The words 'non-medical' should therefore be deleted from Bye-Law 14.

(7) The Bye-Laws allow the election of nurses as Associate Members. Council would recommend that admission should only be to State Registered nurses and not to Enrolled nurses. In the first place admission would in fact be limited to senior nurses who had made particular contributions to psychiatry, and probably had some form of post-registration qualification.

(8) The suggestion has been made that the examination for the qualification might well be held in centres outside London. Council agreed that this should be done at such time as is practicable and reasonable.''

Various points arising out of the General Secretary's statement were raised by members and discussed at some length. It was then agreed to work through the Bye-Laws systematically, and if this was completed to consider the other items on the Agenda, which could otherwise be deferred for discussion at a further session of the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 1–7. Classes of Members: Qualification and Admission of Ordinary Members.

These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 8–10. Qualification and Election of Collegiate Members.

These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting. (A motion "that all reference to applicants for Collegiate Membership being Ordinary Members of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association be deleted'' was defeated.)

It was agreed that the Meeting should adjourn and reassemble after lunch. The President stated that some time would then be devoted to discussion of the proposed Higher Qualification.

Before the adjournment the President announced that the Ad Hoc Committee had pleasure in nominating Professor Erwin Stengel for election as President-Elect for 1965-6. This was approved by acclamation.

It was agreed that Messrs. Barton Mayhew be appointed the Association's auditors for the current year.

On the meeting re-assembling, it was agreed that discussion of the Bye-Laws should continue until 5 p.m., and that there should first be a limited discussion of the higher qualification.

A preliminary debate on the proposed Higher Qualification took place, and it was agreed that full consideration should be given to this matter at a further Adjourned Annual Meeting, probably

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125066307779 Published online by Cambridge University Press

following the February Quarterly Meeting. It was evident that there was great interest in this topic and members were invited, in the meantime, to submit their views to the Special Committee.

The discussion of the Bye-Laws was then resumed.

Bye-Laws 11–13. Qualification and Election of Fellows.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting. (Since the meeting it has been noted that the right of Fellows to nominate for office and membership of the Court of Electors and of Council had been omitted, and a correction to allow for this has been made. Bye-Law 13.)

Bye-Laws 14–17. Qualification and Election of Associate Members.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, amendment being made to Bye-Law 14, by the deletion of reference to "non-medical" professions; thus allowing non-psychiatric medical practitioners to become Associate Members.

Bye-Laws 18–21. Qualification and Election of Honorary Fellows.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 22–24 Qualification and Election of Corresponding Fellows.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 25–33. Withdrawal of Members and Curtailment of Privileges.
These Bye–Laws were approved by the Meeting, subject to legal advice.

Bye-Laws 34–38. Re-instatement and Restitution of Privileges.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 39–43. Payments and Privileges of Members.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, subject to legal advice and the deletion of the anomalous reference to Associate Members' subscriptions being determined by Council.

Bye-Laws 44–53. Branches.
Bye-Laws 44–46 were approved by the Meeting.
Bye-Law 47 was approved by the Meeting, subject to allowance being made for the attendance of deputies at meetings of Council in the place of Branch Representatives.
Bye-Law 48 was passed, subject to provision that in default of a nomination for the office of Chairman coming from a member the Committee of Management shall make a recommendation.

Bye-Laws 49–53 were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 54–62. Special Divisions and Groups.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, subject to provision being made for deputy representatives to attend Council Meetings and for the election of the Chairman, as for the Branches.

Bye-Laws 63–66. Groups.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Law 67. Officers.
This Bye-Law was approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 68–71. The President.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, it being agreed that Bye-Law 68(vi) be amended so that the names of those nominating for the Presidency should not appear on the ballot paper.

Bye-Laws 72–74. Vice-Presidents.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 75–76. Election and Tenure of Office of Other Officers.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 77–80. The Dean.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 81–85. The Registrar.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, subject to provision being made in Bye-Law 81 for the Registrar to summon meetings and keep minutes of the Executive Committee of Council.

Bye-Laws 86–91. The Treasurer.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, subject to legal and accountants' advice.

Bye-Law 92. Audit.
This Bye-Law was approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 93–98. The Editor—The Journal.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 99–101. The Librarian.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Law 102.
This Bye-Law was approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 103–115. The Council
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting, subject to provision under Bye-Law 104(v) for the calling of Special Meetings of Council either by the President or on the written request to the Registrar of twelve members of the Council.

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125066307779 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bye-Laws 116–120. Executive Committee of Council.

Bye-Law 116 was amended and approved as follows:

"An Executive Committee of Council shall be constituted under the direction and control of Council, and shall consist of the President, Registrar, Treasurer and Dean, and six other Fellows and two Collegiate Members who shall be members of Council, elected by Council annually. Meetings shall normally be convened by the Registrar, but the President shall be empowered to call a meeting at any time."

Bye-Laws 117, 118 and 119 were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Law 120 was approved by the Meeting, subject to provision being made for the Executive Committee of Council to report to each meeting of Council, and its activities being reviewed annually by Council.

A motion was passed that wherever "Executive Committee of Council" appeared in other parts of the Bye-Laws the word "Council" should be inserted in its place.

Bye-Laws 121–131. Committees.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 132–139. The Court of Electors.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 140–143. The Higher Qualification.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 144–145. Meetings.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 146–149. Annual General Meetings.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 150–154. Quarterly General Meetings.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 155–160. Special Meetings.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 161–162. Strangers at Meetings.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

Bye-Laws 163–168. Conference of Ordinary Members.
These Bye-Laws were approved by the Meeting.

(Since the Meeting, provision has been made for the Conference to be convened by the Chairman.)

Report of the Special Committee on the Petition for a Supplemental Charter to Change the Name of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association to "Royal College of Psychiatrists".

The following recommendations of the Special Committee, previously approved by Council, were passed by the Meeting:

"(1) That the Association should follow learned Counsel's advice to remain the Royal Medico-Psychological Association, revise the Bye-Laws in order to introduce a Collegiate Structure, and start the higher qualification. Then in two years or so to petition for a Royal College of Psychiatrists, with a good chance of success.

Concurrently with this action, an effort should be made to enlist the positive support of the Royal College of Physicians. Such support might shorten the interval before a successful petition might be achieved.

(2) That the Petition Committee remain in being with changed terms of reference:

(a) with power to petition for a Supplemental Charter at such time as seems wise, having regard to legal advice;

(b) to take such steps, with speed and vigour, as may be possible to shorten the period before submitting the petition;

(c) to report to Council at each meeting."

Motion

The following Motion was passed by the Meeting:

"That this meeting be not dissolved but adjourned to meet again immediately prior to the Annual General Meeting in 1966, or at some earlier time should this seem expedient to Council."

Vote of Thanks

A Vote of Thanks was proposed by Dr. William Sargant and carried by acclamation, to the President, the Immediate Past President, the General Secretary and the Special Committee for the immense amount of work they had put in.

The meeting was concluded.

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125066307779 Published online by Cambridge University Press