

PART IV.—NOTES AND NEWS.

REPORT OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF THE MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

The thirty-fourth annual general meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association was held on Wednesday, July 30th, at the Westminster Palace Hotel, Dr. Lush, M.P., presiding. After the meeting of the Council, the general meeting assembled at eleven o'clock, the following members and visitors being present:—Drs. Burman, Bayley, Blandford, Bodington, Boyd, Bucknill, J. C. Browne, Beach, J. A. Campbell, Cassidy, Clouston, Courtenay, Chapman, Clapham, R. Eager, W. Eager, Evans, J. E. M. Finch, M. Finch, H. Gill, Glover, R. B. Gilland, Hingston, Johnson, Kirkman, J. M. Lindsay, J. G. McDowall, T. W. McDowall, D. Mackintosh, H. F. Manning, Mickley, Mould, Monro, Mickle, H. H. Newington, Orange, Paul, Parsey, Pedler, S. R. Philipps, Rayner, Rutherford, W. H. O. Sankey, Savage, Stocker, Sturge, Swain, Strange, Stewart, Sutherland, Hack Tuke, Harrington Tuke, Urquhart, J. B. Ward, Whitcombe, Wallis, Wickham, Walford, T. O. Wood, Yellowlees.

Dr. CRICHTON BROWNE, the retiring President, expressed his thanks to the officers of the Association for the manner in which they had lightened his duties during his year of office, and congratulated the members of the Association generally in having so able and worthy a President to take his place during the ensuing year.

Dr. Lush, M.P., then took the chair amid much applause.

The General Secretary, Dr. Rayner, presented the minutes of the last annual meeting, which were printed in No. CVII. of this Journal (October, 1878).

The minutes having been taken as read, were confirmed.

Dr. BUCKNILL moved that the hearty thanks of the Association should be tendered to Dr. Crichton Browne for the admirable manner in which he had conducted the business of the Association during the past year. His fairness, industry, diligence, and deep interest in the welfare of the Association were known to them all.

The motion being seconded by Dr. HACK TUKE, was carried unanimously, amid general acclamation, and was suitably responded to by Dr. CRICHTON BROWNE.

The next business being the appointment of a President for the ensuing year,

Dr. CLOUSTON rose and said that it had been suggested among members of their body that there was one important class of interests which had been hitherto unrepresented in the presidential chair—viz., the registered hospitals for the insane. These were very important institutions, and, therefore, should be represented—at all events, occasionally. A member from the North of England was to have proposed the name of the gentleman he was about to name, but unforeseen circumstances had prevented that member from being present, and it accordingly fell to his lot to propose the name of Mr. George W. Mould, Medical Superintendent of the Royal Lunatic Hospital at Cheadle. Mr. Mould was in every respect worthy to fill the chair. In his own district he was looked up to as an authority, and members present had had opportunities of judging of his capabilities. It was thought that this year they ought to have a good man to preside over their deliberations—a particularly good man—on account of the possibility of lunacy legislation. Mr. Mould lived at Manchester, which was within easy reach of London, and he was a gentleman who would take any amount of pains in the interests of the Association.

Dr. BLANDFORD seconded the motion, which was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

Mr. MOULD, in thanking the Association for the honour conferred upon him, stated that he would do his utmost to fulfil the duties of the office to the best of his ability.

It was resolved, upon the motion of Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY, seconded by Dr. CAMPBELL, that Dr. Paul be re-appointed treasurer.

It was resolved, on the motion of Dr. RAYNER, that the present editors of the Journal—viz., Dr. Clouston, Dr. Hack Tuke, and Dr. Savage—be re-appointed for the ensuing year.

Dr. Boyd and Dr. Lindsay were re-elected auditors.

Dr. Rayner was re-elected general secretary, Dr. James Rutherford secretary for Scotland, and Mr. Masiere Courtenay secretary for Ireland.

The PRESIDENT stated that three members of the Council would have to be elected in the place of Dr. Lalor, Dr. Rogers, and Dr. Fraser, who retired.

The following gentlemen were thereupon elected, without opposition, members of the Council:—Mr. E. Swain, of the Three Counties Asylum, proposed by Dr. PAUL; Dr. T. W. McDowall, of the Northumberland Asylum, proposed by Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY; Dr. Ashe, of Dundrum, Ireland, proposed by Dr. COURTENAY.

It was then resolved, on the motion of Dr. BODINGTON, that the next annual meeting should be held in London.

The Association then proceeded to the discussion of the new Rules, proposed by the Council, printed copies of which had been forwarded to the members prior to the meeting.

It was resolved that the proposed new Rules should be read by the General Secretary and considered chapter by chapter. (The Rules, as finally settled by the Association, will be found at the end of the Journal.)

After some discussion on Clause 2, Chapter 1, it was decided to strike out from the end of the clause the words, "and the protection of their interests, so far as these are in accordance with the other objects of the Association."

Upon Clause 3 being taken, a Member asked whether any duly qualified medical practitioner would be eligible as a member of the Association? when the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the wording of the clause would admit any person being a properly qualified medical practitioner.

Dr. STEWART thereupon enquired whether it was intended that they should admit lady practitioners? The words, as printed in the draft, were "medical practitioners," and with a view to avoid anything like a personal question, which might hereafter arise, he should propose that the words should be altered to "medical men."

The PRESIDENT observed that undoubtedly, as the words stood in the draft, any medical practitioner would be eligible, whether male or female.

Dr. HARRINGTON TUKE reminded the Association that some years back a question had arisen in reference to honorary members, who were not medical men. He should be glad to know what had become of those members.

Dr. RAYNER, the General Secretary, stated that one or two of them were still honorary members of the Society.

Dr. ORANGE pointed out that the question would arise at an election of members, but Dr. Stewart repeated that his object was to decide the matter at once, so as to prevent it coming up in that way as a personal question.

Chapter 1, as amended and printed in the Rules, was then agreed to.

In Chapter 2, Dr. CLOUSTON suggested that the Council should consist of the officers and *twelve* other members of the Association, instead of *six*, as proposed, *six* being a quorum, the Council to meet not less than *twice* a year. These suggested alterations were agreed to, and it was also determined to strike out the provision as to the Council voting by ballot.

In Clause 4 it was suggested by Dr. YELLOWLEES that the powers of the

Council in regard to the grant of investigation funds to committees should be limited, but Dr. HACK TUKE pointed out the difficulty which would arise if the Council had to wait till the General Meeting before the committees could be furnished with funds. Chapter 2, as amended, was then agreed to.

Chapter 3 was agreed to without alteration.

In Chapter 4 a new Rule was adopted, upon the motion of Dr. STEWART, seconded by Dr. WICKHAM, providing for the holding of intermediate meetings.

Chapter 4 was, with certain verbal alterations, then agreed to.

Chapter 5 was agreed to without alteration.

In Chapter 6 the Association decided, upon the motion of Dr. YELLOWLEES, to strike out a clause providing that one month previously to each Annual or Quarterly Meeting the Secretary should forward to every member a list of the candidates for admission as ordinary members, together with the names of the members by whom they were recommended. It was further decided to dispense with a composition payment of ten guineas as a life subscription, proposed in the draft Rules.

With certain verbal alterations, Chapter 6 was then agreed to.

Chapter 7 was passed in its entirety.

In Chapter 8 Dr. YELLOWLEES proposed, and Dr. MONTAGU FINCH seconded, that the clause, relating to diplomas to corresponding members, should be omitted; but after some discussion it was decided, by a majority of two, that the clause should be retained. Chapter 8 was then agreed to.

In Chapter 9 considerable discussion arose upon a proposed rule that the travelling expenses of the Secretaries for Ireland and Scotland, and of Members of Council, residing at a distance greater than fifty miles from London, should be paid to them from the funds of the Association, excepting in the case of the meeting of Council, held immediately previous to the Annual General Meeting.

Dr. CLOUSTON moved that this Rule should be struck out. It would cost so much money that it would very soon ruin the Association. He could say on behalf of the Scotch Members of the Council, that they did not consider that the funds should be spent in that way, but should be reserved for some useful purpose. Their balance sheet did not justify this heavy additional expenditure.

Dr. RUTHERFORD agreed with Dr. Clouston that the clause should be struck out, and seconded his motion to that effect.

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY stated that the expenditure involved would not be so large as Dr. Clouston imagined. He would propose that the allowance should be limited—say to £15 a quarter. He referred to the advantage which the Association would gain in ensuring a more frequent attendance of country members at the Council Meetings.

Dr. BUCKNILL urged that the Rule should stand, it having been very carefully considered at the hands of the Council.

Dr. STEWART considered that Dr. Murray Lindsay had rather under-rated than over-rated the importance of bringing gentlemen from great distances, but he thought that the proposal would be a great tax upon the funds if the whole of the expenses were paid. He would consent to Dr. Murray Lindsay's limitation.

Dr. YELLOWLEES protested against the proposal as absurd.

Dr. HACK TUKE stated that he had opposed the proposed rule at the Council Meeting, and he should oppose it on this occasion. As to the compromise which had been proposed, he thought it unworthy of the Association. When those who were most concerned in the proposal which had been made, were altogether averse to it, he could not understand for what reason such a rule should be introduced.

The amendment by Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY in favour of the payment of the travelling expenses to a limited amount, was then put to the vote, and was lost by a large majority.

Dr. CLOUSTON'S motion for the omission of the clause was then put to the vote, and carried. The clause was accordingly struck out.

Dr. YELLOWLEES then moved the omission from Clause 3 of a provision that if unable to attend personally a member might return his list for the ballot enclosed (without his signature) in an envelope, itself enclosed in another envelope containing also his name, addressed to the President, on or before the morning of the election.

Dr. CAMPBELL seconded the omission of the clause.

Dr. PARSEY referred to the difficulty of rousing the interest of distant members in this Association, diffused as it was over the whole kingdom. He hoped that the rule would be agreed to, as he felt sure that it would be attended by beneficial results to the Association.

Dr. STEWART supported the proposed rule, and referred to other Associations in which a similar arrangement existed.

Dr. HACK TUKE strongly supported the retention of the clause. If rejected, the Rule which preceded it would be so restricted in its operation as to render the proposed change in the election of officers almost nugatory.

Dr. Yellowlees' amendment having been put to the vote, was declared to be carried, and the clause in question was accordingly expunged.

Chapter 9, as amended, was then agreed to.

Chapter 10 was passed without alteration, as was also Chapter 11, with a small verbal alteration in the first clause.

In Chapter 12 Dr. HARRINGTON TUKE referred to the report of the proceedings at the Annual Meeting of the Association in 1877, and proposed that it should be clearly laid down that the General Secretary should be responsible for the correctness of the Reports of the Annual Meetings. A verbal addition to this effect was agreed to, and Chapter 12 was then approved.

In Chapter 13 some discussion arose upon the last clause which required that any member objecting to a decision of the Editor or Editors, or to the manner in which the Journal was conducted, or feeling aggrieved by any comments in the Journal, should submit any objections or complaints he might desire to make, to the Council before appealing to the General Meeting.

Dr. HACK TUKE said that although he thought the Rule as brought in by the Council was sufficiently clear, he had not the slightest objection to an amendment suggested by Dr. BUCKNILL.

The clause was ultimately agreed to in this form.

The new Rules, as finally amended and settled, were then declared to be adopted.

The next business being the presentation of the treasurer's accounts for the past year, Dr. PAUL submitted the balance-sheet, which will be found on the next page, the same having been duly examined and certified as correct by Dr. Boyd and Dr. Murray Lindsay.

M. Charcot, of Paris, and Dr. Echeverria, of New York, having been proposed as honorary members, in accordance with the Rules, by Dr. HACK TUKE, were unanimously elected.

The election of new ordinary members was then proceeded with to the number of 26, viz. :—

Clarke, Henry, L.R.C.P., Lond., H.M. Prison, Wakefield.

Roots, William Sudbury, M.R.C.S., Canbury House, Kingston-on-Thames.

Higgins, William H., M.B., C.M., Asst. Med. Officer, Leicester County Asylum.

Blanchard, E. C., M.D., The Asylum, Charlotte Town, Prince Edward's Island.

Crampton, John S., L.R.C.P. Edin., Assist. Med. Officer, Boro' Asylum, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Kay, Walter S., M.B., Asst. Med. Officer, South Yorkshire Asylum, Wadsley, near Sheffield.

Hicks, Henry, M.D., Hendon House, Hendon, Middlesex.

THE MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

The Treasurer's Annual Balance Sheet, 1878-79.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.	EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
To Balance—Cash in Hand	479 9 7	By Annual and Quarterly Meetings	86 3 6
To Subscriptions received	227 17 0	By Editorial Expenses	12 12 0
By Secretary for Ireland	32 11 0	Printing, publishing, engraving, advertising expenses, and postage of Journal	328 8 1
By Secretary for Scotland	48 6 0	By Printing and expenses of circulars for Meetings	15	14	8
By Sale of Journal, Messrs. Churchill	118 16 0	By Treasurer	6 6 0
				By Secretary for Ireland	0 4 6
				By Secretary for Scotland	7 4 6
				By General Secretary	0 19 6
				By Purchase of £205 7s. 10d. 3 per cent. Consols	200	0	0
				By Balance in Treasurer's hands	299 6 10
			<u>£906 19 7</u>				<u>£906 19 7</u>

Audited and found correct,

R. BOYD,
J. MURRAY LINDSAY, } AUDITORS.

J. H. PAUL,
TREASURER.

LONDON, July 30th, 1879.

Forrest, J. G. Stracey, L.R.C.P., Asst. Med. Officer, Camberwell House.
 Granville, J. Mortimer, M.D., 18, Euston square.
 Dodds, William J., M.D., D.Sc. Edin., Asst. Med. Officer, Royal Asylum, Montrose.
 Ronaldson, J. Bruce, L.R.C.P. Edin., Med. Officer, District Asylum, Haddington.
 Wood, William E. Ramsden, M.A., M.B., F.R.C.S. Edin., Bethlem Hospital.
 Lewis, W. Bevan, L.R.C.P. Lond., Asst. Med. Officer, West Riding Asylum, Wakefield.
 Birt, Ernest, L.R.C.P. Lond., Asst. Med. Officer, West Riding Asylum, Wakefield.
 Campbell, Colin M., M.B., C.M., Asst. Med. Officer, The Retreat, York.
 Nicholson, W. Rumney, M.R.C.S., Asst. Med. Officer, North Riding Asylum, Clifton, York.
 Thompson, Arnold, M.D., Sudbury, Harrow.
 Cobbold, C. S. W., M.D., Leavesden, Herts.
 Clark, Archibald Campbell, M.B. Edin., Royal Asylum, Morningside, Edinburgh.
 Sankey, H. B., M.B., Senr. Asst. Med. Officer, Prestwich Asylum.
 Gwynn, S. T., M.D., St. Mary's House, Whitechurch, Salop.
 Peacock, H. G., County Asylum, Melton, Suffolk.
 Squire, R. H., B.A. Cantab., Asst. Med. Officer, Whittingham, Lancashire.
 Seed, William, M.B., C.M., Edin., Asst. Med. Officer, Whittingham, Lancashire.
 Parkinson, John R., M.R.C.S., Asst. Med. Officer, Whittingham, Lancashire.
 Hood, Donald, M.B., M.R.C.P. Lond., 43, Green street, W.
 The Meeting then adjourned until three o'clock in the afternoon.

AFTERNOON MEETING.

Dr. LUSH, M.P., the President, again took the chair. In thanking the Association for electing him their President, he observed that he did not pretend to any special knowledge in psychology, and he could not believe that it was on that account that they had done him that honour. Possibly it had been the position which it had been his good fortune to hold in the House of Commons. In the address which he was about to read to them, he did not propose to enter into matters of science, but he should draw their attention to a few facts and statistics. He believed that, generally speaking, the vast mass of the people of this country took really little or no interest whatever in psychology; they were disposed rather to ignore it as a nuisance, and, therefore, it was only within the limits of an Association like this that facts could be thrown together and inferences drawn for the benefit of their fellow creatures. He then read his address, which is printed at page 309 of this Journal. (Original Article, No. 1.)

Dr. BODINGTON congratulated the members of the Association on having so able a President. In his (the speaker's) opinion the subject of licensed houses had been dealt with in the Inaugural Address with great moderation. He wished to draw the attention of the Association to a statement which was made to the Select Committee on Lunatics in 1859, by Mr. William George Campbell. That gentleman stated (p. 380)—“I think that great care should be used, when we surround asylums with so many safeguards, that we do not degrade them, and also those who keep them; I speak of licensed houses. . . . It is desirable to try and induce persons of the highest character only to take licensed houses and receive patients. I am afraid that by degrading them, and showing such extreme suspicion of all those persons, by treating every one who has the care of an asylum or licensed house as a person who is *prima facie* a man who would take advantage of his patients, and deprive them of their liberty for profit, we shall be doing an injury to the cause.” He stated that there was a strong feeling among private asylum proprietors that they

would be glad to get rid of the unpleasant position in which they were placed. Speaking for himself, he writhed under the charges that were made in all directions, charges calculated not to drive them into honourable and upright practices current among gentlemen, but to bring out the bad qualities in man's nature. He wanted to be released from all this, but he entirely objected to be driven out upon false pretences, upon charges that were untrue and baseless. If they were to be driven out, it should be upon some definite ground, either by proving the charges made against them, or else by the simple weight of public opinion. He, for one, was perfectly willing to acquiesce with public opinion. If public opinion should drive out the licensed house proprietors, and afterwards find out its mistake, it would be for public opinion to rectify the mistake. Consequently, he, for one, should not hold up a finger against any measure that might be brought forward in a fair manner. It had frequently been asserted that they could afford to despise all charges made against them in all directions. Well, take newspaper articles—articles in newspapers were certainly sometimes despicable in the last degree. They would remember the case of Peter Chance, which was brought before the notice of the Select Committee. Being a man of means, this gentleman's complaint was that he was committed by the magistrates, in conjunction, if he remembered rightly, with a Poor Law officer, to the County Asylum at Worcester. Thereupon the Birmingham newspapers published rabid articles about Peter Chance being incarcerated in a private asylum; yet he was never in a private asylum in his life. All those things they could certainly afford to despise; but the case was different when it came to this—that articles were published in a leading medical journal making wholesale attacks upon them—attacks not less virulent than the attacks in those journals and novels with which they were familiar. It was said, again, that they could afford to despise the medical journals—that journalism and journalists, and everything connected with them, might fairly be despised, and that they might snap their fingers at them all; but he could not forget that the "British Medical Journal" was the organ of eight thousand members of the medical profession, and if they were silent as to what had been said lately in its columns, they might, perhaps, be taken to acquiesce in the charges made. Now he, for one, was not content to sit down quietly under those charges. The writer talked about private imprisonment; he compared them to the officers of the press gang; he asserted that if such and such things happened, the private asylums would fade away; and he adopted throughout a tone of sneering and abuse which was unjustifiable and indecent in such a journal as the "British Medical Journal." These articles included all private asylum proprietors in one vague charge, without any specification of cases. It was simply a random hitting and slashing in all directions. Everybody connected with private asylums was included in the early part of these articles; no exception was made. It was true that afterwards, to some extent, some exceptions were made, but was it fair first of all to accuse a body of men such as the private asylum proprietors—most of them medical men, members of a profession which treats its honour as its own good—was it fair to accuse them first of all, and then to acquit a few of those asylums, which, according to the view of this anonymous writer, were to be retained? It appeared that in the article of the 12th April the writer had taken the report of the Commissioners in Lunacy for the year 1865, and had in a most unfair way run through the complaints made by the Commissioners in that year against private asylums. Now, he (the speaker) maintained that those were the most ridiculous and trumpery charges possible. He would undertake to take the reports of the public asylums, treat them in the same way, and find out similar charges against public asylums. He felt that the private asylum proprietors were at bay. They were a small body of men—about one hundred at the outside—but they had their honour at heart, and must stand up for it. He begged to propose that the most cordial thanks of the Association be tendered to the President for his able address.

Dr. HARRINGTON TUKK, in seconding the vote of thanks, referred to the position held by the President in the House of Commons, and congratulated the members of the Association upon having so able a gentleman to represent their interests.

The expression of the thanks of the Association was then conveyed to the President by Dr. Rayner, the general secretary.

Dr. MONRO observed that the representatives of both private and public asylums would agree in feeling the great honour which Dr. Lush had conferred upon them by occupying the chair. It was at the present moment of the greatest importance that they should have a voice in the House of Commons. He happened to be the proprietor of an asylum of one hundred and fifty years' standing (laughter). His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather had all had their interests identified with it, and he personally felt very much these ferocious attacks. It was, perhaps, not what might be termed a very glorious cause to fight in, and therefore he had never been in the least inclined to answer any attack, but that was not because he had not felt it (hear, hear). Now, the very first thing he ever wrote was upon the subject of "Reform in Private Asylums." He would have them subjected to the greatest amount of inspection. With all his heart he wished they were at an end; but he did not want them to be pushed aside with an ill grace. One thing in these late attacks had been very unfair—that which concerned Lord Shaftesbury's evidence. They all respected Lord Shaftesbury; there was not a man in the kingdom in whose good opinion they would wish to stand higher than in his. But his evidence in 1859 and 1877 was about as opposite as anything could well be. In 1859 there was hardly a word bad enough for him to use about private asylums, but when he gave evidence before the Select Committee in 1877, one of his last observations was that so high was his opinion of private asylums, that if it should please the Almighty to impose such an affliction upon him, he hoped he might be treated in a private asylum. Therefore it was very unfair for writers to bring up Lord Shaftesbury's evidence in 1859. He hoped that they had all improved in twenty years. He was anxious, if private asylums were dispensed with, that his fellow proprietors and himself should be allowed to go out in a pleasant and agreeable way! The majority of the gentlemen in that room were connected with public asylums, and they could not help looking upon the proprietors of private asylums as a little party of interested men who were thinking too much of their private interests. If they were to be driven out—and he hoped they would be driven out—he was most particularly anxious that they should go out in favour with the country generally, and especially in favour with this Association.

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY had been connected with an excellent private asylum, and thought that those members who were engaged in public asylums ought to tender their deep sympathy to those private asylum proprietors whose feelings had been so deeply wounded, and who had been, he thought, so unfairly and unjustly treated by the Press.

Dr. HAYES NEWINGTON said that he did not think that Select Committees were of any use unless the opinions given by the witnesses were held to with some consistency. A very eminent witness had already been quoted—viz., Lord Shaftesbury. There was another eminent witness who was present at this meeting; he referred to Dr. Bucknill. Would he be in order in reading what Dr. Bucknill had said before the Select Committee?

The CHAIRMAN ruled that under the circumstances the evidence proposed to be read would be admissible.

Dr. NEWINGTON then read the following statements made before the Select Committee by Dr. Bucknill, in answer to Mr. Dillwyn:—

I mean that private asylums in fact should be under County Boards, the same as pauper asylums?—"That resembles the constitution of a hospital for the insane. I think that there is ample room for the existence of both classes of institutions. I cannot express too high an opinion of the hospitals for the insane. I think that side by side with them the private asylums may

contrive to exist very well, performing a somewhat separate function."—In any case do you think it desirable that keepers of asylums should have a direct pecuniary interest in patients confined in them?—"If you had to begin *de novo*, I should say it would be a bad principle to adopt; but the thing exists, and there is a large interest in it, and it would be very difficult, and, I think, undesirable, to abolish it. The right policy, I think, is to try and improve these places as much as possible."—Would it not be desirable to get rid of them by degrees?—"I should be sorry to see them got rid of."

May I ask why?

"Because the best of them serve a very useful purpose. I do not know that the hospitals for the insane would quite replace them; certainly they would be very far from replacing some of the private asylums with which I am well acquainted."

Dr. BUCKNILL stated that he still entirely agreed with what he said at that time. There were many private asylums which he considered had served an excellent purpose, and it would be very difficult to replace them by public ones; but he was also obliged to add that there were many private asylums as to which it would be for the public benefit and the interest of the insane that they should be shut up as soon as possible. The difficulty seemed to be to determine which those should be. Members present would remember Lord Shaftesbury's description of some of the large asylums in the Metropolitan district. It was certainly long ago, but those asylums still existed.

Dr. BODINGTON asked if his lordship had not recalled his opinion?

Dr. BUCKNILL said that upon the present occasion he should be very sorry to enter more fully into the matter, but Lord Shaftesbury had stated in his evidence in 1877 that all that he had said in 1859 he adhered to.

The PRESIDENT—Do you mean he reiterated that that was existing in 1877 which he described in 1859?

Dr. BUCKNILL—No; he said, "All that I said in 1859 I adhere to at the present time," or words to that effect.

The PRESIDENT—He adhered to the truth of his statement; but did he mean to assert that that was the condition of things existing in 1877?

Dr. BUCKNILL—Yes, I so understood him.

The PRESIDENT—That was not the impression which Lord Shaftesbury's evidence left upon the minds of the Committee, or they would not have made the report they did.

Dr. BUCKNILL went on to say that the interests of private asylum proprietors were not so large as they appeared. There were 98 private asylums in England and Wales, and only one-half of them were licensed to medical men alone. The others were licensed to laymen or to women, or to medical men in partnership with medical men. Then all those licensed to medical men were not actually owned by the medical men they were leased to; so that the question was a very small one for this Association. The Association represented a very large body of men interested in the treatment of the insane. There were 500 public appointments connected with the insane in the three kingdoms. Besides that there was a vast number of men interested in the matter who did not hold public appointments. Looking at the 49 medical proprietors of private asylums, many of whom were not proprietors in any sense, it really became a very small matter.

Dr. SANKEY (Cheltenham) protested against this view, and said that it did not signify whether the private asylums belonged to the superintendent or to a company; to a few or to many; these were attacks upon the honour of the medical superintendents, and they were not only attacks upon private asylum proprietors, but upon public asylum officials, and, practically, upon every man who was a medical man. They were all interested in maintaining the honour of their profession.

Dr. HACK TUKE remarked—turning to quite another aspect of the Address—that he thought the President had taken a somewhat too gloomy view of the future in regard to the increase of lunacy. Members were aware that during the last few years there had been many causes for an *apparent* increase of insanity, and there was, he hoped and believed, no reason to suppose that there would be anything like the same ratio of increase in the future, although

he feared there was some real, as well as apparent, increase at the present time. In the nine years between 1859 and 1868 the increase of lunatics was 24.43 per cent., but between 1868 and 1877 it was only 16.83 per cent., showing a decline of 7.6 per cent. in the ratio of increase. The causes of the rise in the registered number of lunatics did not exert the same influence in the latter period, and he thought that a hundred years hence the reported number of lunatics would not be found to have increased in anything like the ratio at which it had been increasing during the last 50 years.

The next business on the agenda paper was a resolution proposed by Dr. CLOUSTON, "That this Association petition the General Medical Council to have mental diseases made a subject of examination for all degrees and licenses to practice medicine in the United Kingdom." Dr. Clouston said that the present was a very good time to bring this subject forward, for the whole question of medical education was now undergoing a searching enquiry, and the subject of mental disease had attracted the attention of many members of the Medical Council as being a subject with which every medical man should be well acquainted.

Dr. BUCKNILL had great pleasure in seconding this proposal. It was a matter in which he had taken a strong interest, and he was very glad to find that it had the support of practical and energetic men. He had done what he could at the College of Physicians of London to get mental disease recognised as a subject for a license, as it is for a membership, and it would have been done some time ago had it not been for the Conjoint Scheme. Now that the whole matter was in its present state, he thought it was a happy and propitious time for the Association to advocate this very necessary extension of medical education.

After some further discussion, Dr. Clouston's motion was carried unanimously.

At this point Dr. BUCKNILL asked to be allowed to express the regret of his friend, Dr. John Gray, of Utica, that he had been unable to be present at the meeting to-day. He referred to it in connection with the preceding matter because Dr. Gray was one of the most successful of the teachers of mental disease. That gentleman had a very large class of students and medical men, consisting sometimes of 500 people, and patients were sent to him to examine and make his diagnosis before his class.

On the motion of Dr. BUCKNILL, an expression of the thanks of the Association was accorded to Dr. Blandford for the great time and trouble he had bestowed in compiling an Index to the "Journal of Mental Science." It was very carefully and thoroughly made.

The PRESIDENT said that before passing away from the question of private asylums, he should like to say a few words. He recognised a genial and kindly feeling on the part of all the speakers, and if on the side of the private asylum proprietors it had appeared that there was some little irritation and consequent warmth and energy of speech, it must not be wondered at, as it was a very natural condition of the human mind. As regarded Lord Shaftesbury's evidence, there was no doubt—taking it as an isolated portion of the text—that the observation quoted by Dr. Bucknill did fall from his Lordship's lips; but he (Dr. Lush) distinctly understood Lord Shaftesbury to make a most honourable retraction of all those charges as applicable now. He said—"I may name Ticehurst as being an asylum which it would be a national loss to do away with." They might extend his Lordship's observations to other asylums besides Ticehurst. He (Dr. Lush) felt satisfied that the whole tendency of the evidence of the Commissioners, and of Dr. Bucknill himself, and others who had a right to speak and to be believed, was that the charges against private asylums had fallen to the ground; the allegations which led to the formation of the Select Committee were without basis; and the opinion of the Committee was that the less vigour or strength there was in the report, the

more it would appear to the public that they had no reason to be alarmed; and that thus Charlatanism would be checked. This was the reason that the report was so framed. It had had the effect of wonderfully quieting the public mind in the matter. There were, of course, a number of dissatisfied persons—that was a characteristic of our race—but he could not help thinking that if some of the writers on these matters since the examination of the Select Committee, had taken the trouble to read the evidence, a great deal of the writing which had appeared since would not have appeared at all. He thought that the matter should not be shirked. Although but “a small question,” numerically speaking, still it was a high and lofty principle which was involved, and he did not consider it right that a body of men, who had worked for the public good should be reprehended and insulted in the way in which they had been.

The next business being a series of Resolutions to be proposed by Dr. Murray Lindsay,

Dr. LINDSAY said that the subject which he was about to bring before the Association was one of very great interest to those who were engaged in County Lunacy administration. It had been discussed lately at the Quarterly Meeting, and several resolutions had been submitted to that meeting, but eventually only one was passed; but it was passed unanimously:—“That in the opinion of this meeting, the granting pensions to the officers and staffs of County and Borough Lunatic Asylums should be no longer permissive, but compulsory.” Since that Quarterly Meeting that resolution had not satisfied him. If it were incorporated in an Act to-morrow, it would be of very little service to them. Something more definite was needed. He had, therefore, drawn up the series of resolutions which would be found on the Agenda paper. He had also communicated a copy of these resolutions to every Superintendent of Public Asylums in England, Ireland, and Scotland, asking for their opinions or suggestions. There were 109 in all. He had also been in communication with a large number of his professional brethren, and he was satisfied that there was a very general feeling of dissatisfaction with the present regulations. In one country they had a permissive system; in another country they had a compulsory scale, but it was very unsatisfactory, and in Scotland there was no provision at all. He had accordingly come to the conclusion that the time had arrived when pauper lunacy might be considered to be public service, and when all the asylums in the three countries might be treated as in the same class. It might be interesting for members to know that the total number of replies from the 109 Superintendents had been 92. A few others declined to sign the circular, although in favour of some parts of the resolutions; so that the percentage of replies was for England, 90·6 per cent.; for Scotland, 73·9 per cent.; and for Ireland, 77·2 per cent. The suggestions which he had received had been very numerous and very excellent, and he had modified his resolutions so as to embody, as far as possible the suggestions of his numerous correspondents. He would now propose his first resolution, viz.:—“That the Clauses in the Lunacy and other Acts affecting the Superannuation of the Officers and Servants of County and Borough Lunatic Asylums and Metropolitan District Insane or Imbecile Asylums in England, the Royal Chartered, District, and Parochial Asylums in Scotland, and District Asylums in Ireland, require revision and amendment. That legislative provision as regards superannuation should include, and be made equally applicable to, the officers and servants of all the said Pauper Asylums in the United Kingdom.” He might mention that taking the total of his replies to the circulars, he found that in England all but one were in favour of this resolution, whilst in Scotland and Ireland all were in favour of it.

Dr. RAYNER seconded the resolution, which was carried.

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY then moved Resolution No. 2, viz.:—“That the power of granting retiring allowances to said officers and servants should no longer be merely permissive, but they should be entitled to claim pensions, as a

matter of right, after a certain period of service, and according to some fixed or known scale." Of the replies received from English Superintendents, all but two were in favour of this resolution, whilst in Scotland and Ireland the whole of the replies were in favour of it.

Dr. McDOWALL seconded the motion, which was carried.

At the suggestion of the PRESIDENT, No. 4 Resolution on the Agenda was made No. 3, and it was accordingly moved by Dr. LINDSAY, as follows:—"That Medical Officers should be placed under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and at least on the same footing and scale with regard to pension as the Commissioners in Lunacy, and other first-class civil servants, viz., one-sixtieth for every year of service, ten years being added on appointment as Medical Officer. In estimating pensions, the whole of the several emoluments of the office, as well as the salary or wages, being the total value of the office, should be taken into account."

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY stated that 84 per cent. of the replies in England, 94 per cent. in Scotland, and the whole of the Irish replies were in favour of this resolution. He might also mention, in reference to the proposal in the motion for adding ten years on appointment, that they might, perhaps, fairly claim fifteen or even twenty years. In Section 4 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act of 1859 provision had been made for special service, a designation in which he thought that their own service might properly be included. The words were "not exceeding twenty years." The whole of the section read thus:—"It shall be lawful for the Commissioners of the Treasury, from time to time, by any order or warrant, to declare that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of any office or class of offices to be specified in such order or warrant, professional, or other peculiar qualifications, not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, are required, and that it is for the interest of the public that persons should be appointed thereto, at an age exceeding that at which public service ordinarily begins; and by the same, or any other order or warrant, to direct that when any person now holding, or who may hereafter be appointed to such office, or any of such class of offices, shall retire from the public service, a number of years not exceeding twenty, to be specified in the said order or warrant, shall, in computing the amount of superannuation allowance which may be granted to him, under the foregoing section of this Act, be added to the number of years during which he may have actually served, and also to direct that, in respect of such office, or class of offices, the period of service required to entitle the holders to superannuation may be a period less than ten years, to be specified in the order or warrant; and also to direct that in respect of such office, or class of offices, the holder may be entitled to superannuation, though he may not hold his appointment directly from the Crown, and may not have entered the service with a certificate from the Civil Service Commissioners. Provided always that every order or warrant made under this enactment shall be laid before Parliament."

The PRESIDENT suggested that it would be a simpler plan to adopt the words of the Section, and say "not exceeding twenty years," and with this verbal alteration the resolution, having been duly seconded, was declared to be carried.

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY then moved Resolution No. 4:—"That the regulation of the salaries, emoluments, wages, and pensions of the officers and servants of county, borough, district, and parochial asylums should be transferred to the Imperial Government, and the Treasury Capitation Grant of 4s, instead of going to the Union, or Poor Law Guardians, should be applied to the payment of said salaries, emoluments, wages, and pensions, as well as to the payment of the repairs of the fabric, alterations, and future extensions of the buildings." Seventy-nine per cent. of the replies from English Superintendents, 70 per cent. of those from Scotland, and all of those from Ireland were in favour of this resolution. A few of his correspondents had objected to it, and raised the question as to how far the Superintendents would be better off under Govern-

ment than under their present supervision; but it appeared to him that this was not a question as between magisterial and Government administration, for he thought that in a year or two some change would be inevitable, and they must make up their minds between administration by Government and administration by guardians. The management of guardians would not tend to raise the asylums.

Dr. KIRKMAN seconded the motion.

Several speakers having referred to the difficulty which would result from any attempt to divert the Capitation Grant of 4s. per week from its original source, Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY agreed to strike out from his motion that portion of it which related to the grant, and it was ultimately resolved:—"That the regulation of the salaries, emoluments, wages, and pensions of the officers and servants of county, borough, district, and parochial asylums should be transferred to the Imperial Government."

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY then moved Resolution No. 5, viz:—"That service should be considered continuous or unbroken, notwithstanding change from one pauper, imbecile, or public asylum to another, or appointment to the Lunacy Board, and should reckon towards pension, but such service should be of not less than three years' duration in any one public asylum." Nearly all the replies he had received were in favour of this resolution.

Dr. RAYNER seconded the motion, which was carried.

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY then moved Resolution No. 6:—"That there should be compulsory retirement after a certain age, or after a certain period of service, at least in the case of medical and other superior officers."

Dr. MURRAY LINDSAY stated that of the replies he had received 79 per cent. from England, 94 per cent. from Scotland, and 82 per cent. from Ireland were in favour of the resolution.

After discussion it was, however, negatived, on the motion of Dr. STRANGE. It was then resolved:—"That a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President, be forwarded by the General Secretary of the Association to the Home Secretary, and to the Commissioners in Lunacy for England, Scotland, and Ireland, and that a deputation be appointed to wait upon the Commissioners in Lunacy on the subject of these resolutions. That these resolutions be printed, and copies sent to all Members of Parliament, and to the Committees of Visitors and Asylum Boards of all the county, borough, chartered, district, and parochial asylums in the United Kingdom."

Dr. F. A. CHAPMAN then moved:—"That this Association should petition both Houses of Parliament, and present a memorial to the Home Secretary, calling attention to the present state of the law under which criminal and ex-criminal patients are sent to county asylums, and praying that it be remedied, and that if any deputation on this subject to the Home Office be formed, that this Association be represented in it." In moving the resolution, Dr. Chapman said that as time was running short, and the matter had been before the Association some five or six years ago, when a committee of the Association was appointed to carry out similar action to that contemplated in the resolution moved, it would be unnecessary to enter into the merits of the question, but he would only explain that there was a somewhat influential movement being at present made in the matter by visitors and superintendents of county asylums, and that it would be very desirable for the Medico-Psychological Association to add the weight of its influence and opinion. He did not advise the verbatim adoption of the petition drawn up by asylum visitors, as there were some expressions in it he could not recommend the Association to adopt, although the general sense of the petition was in harmony with the views held by the Association.

Dr. YELLOWLEES, in seconding the motion, observed that criminal lunatics were most undesirable inmates of a county asylum.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Owing to the lateness of the hour, it was resolved that the two following papers, which were to have been discussed at this meeting, should be taken as read, and printed in the Journal, viz :—

1. By Dr. J. Wilkie Burman, "On the Desirableness of providing a Detached Hospital, for special purposes, in connection with every large Public Lunatic Asylum." (See Original Articles, No. 2.)

2. By Dr. Fletcher Beach, "On a Case of Tumour of the Brain, associated with Epilepsy and Catalepsy." (See Original Articles, No. 3.)

The proceedings then terminated. The Members of the Association dined together in the evening at the Ship Hotel, Greenwich.

THE MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

The Quarterly Meeting of the Association was held June 18th, 1879, at the Rooms of the London Medical Society, Chandos Street, at 8.30 p.m., Dr. CRICHTON BROWNE, President of the Association, in the chair.

Dr. SUTHERLAND exhibited a case of chorea, in a woman of advanced age (See Clinical Cases). Twenty-five years ago the patient had an attack of chorea, which was produced by her anxiety concerning her husband, who was a soldier in the Crimea. From that time until recently she had had no attack, but six months back she trampled a nail into her heel, and this accident resulted in her present attack, from which she was recovering. Tetanic symptoms had followed immediately upon the injury to her foot. The movements were most violent on the left side of the jaw and the left leg. She was very much debilitated, and could hardly walk, although before her accident she sometimes walked twenty miles a day. It was somewhat unusual to meet with a case of chorea in a woman of her advanced age. Of course the case was very much mixed up with hysteria.

The PRESIDENT remarked that the mere appearance of the head might suggest paralysis agitans rather than chorea, and referred to the effect which fear and apprehension had in producing tetanus. This disease was much more prevalent among South Sea Islanders prior to their conversion to Christianity.

Dr. SAVAGE thought that an attack of paralysis agitans coming on insidiously in that way would not have improved as this had done. Under all the circumstances it might, he considered, be called chorea, but he doubted whether all movements of this kind would continue to be thus classed. This case was, at all events, a very important one.

The PRESIDENT, in opening the discussion, alluded to the presence of an eminent medical gentleman from the other hemisphere, the Editor of the "American Journal of Insanity," Dr. John Gray. The Members of the Association were under considerable obligation to that gentleman on account of the aid which he had rendered those of their number who had visited America, and it would give all present great pleasure if they might look forward to his presence at the Annual Meeting of the Association.

Dr. GRAY thanked the President and the Members of the Association generally for the cordial reception accorded to him, and stated that he hoped he might be able to be present at their Annual Meeting to listen to their discussions, and to learn all that he could in regard to lunacy treatment in this country. As regards the question immediately under discussion, he was sorry to say that in America they had no pensions. Perhaps they were too young for that. He trusted that the English Lunacy doctors would succeed in establishing a thoroughly satisfactory and just system of pensions, and their American brethren would then be only too thankful to take up that system and apply it to themselves.

Dr. LINDSAY stated that in order to narrow the discussion, he proposed to