

## MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

THE fifty-fourth annual meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland was held on July 25th and 26th, 1895, under the presidency of Dr. NICOLSON, at the rooms of the Association, 11, Chandos Street, Cavendish Square. Dr. Rayner was elected Editor in place of the late Dr. Hack Tuke, and it was decided that the Association should be incorporated.

In the afternoon the PRESIDENT took the chair, and, after presenting an illustrated memorial and silver bowl to Dr. Paul, who had been Treasurer of the Association for thirty-one years, delivered an address on Crime, Criminals, and Criminal Lunatics. From his experience as a prison doctor many years ago, he was of opinion that, though there were a certain number of weak-minded criminals who in the face of temptation were unable to resist it, and thereby became criminal, yet in the large majority of cases criminality showed itself as a positive propensity to evil-doing. He agreed with a large part of the phraseology and descriptions which Lombroso and others had given, but these descriptions applied to a minority of criminals only. He denied that there was such a thing as a criminal neurosis, or instinctive criminality, that belongs to a group of persons who make themselves amenable to the law.

Sir EDMUND DU CANE and Drs. ORANGE, CLOUSTON, and CONOLLY NORMAN discussed the views set forth in the address, and the PRESIDENT replied.

Dr. RIVERS then read a paper on Experiment Psychology in Relation to Insanity, illustrated by an apparatus for measuring choice time.

On July 26th, Drs. CLOUSTON and BATTY TUKE opened a discussion on Rest and Exercise in the Treatment of Insanity. Dr. Clouston was strongly in favour of exercise. Rest, in the sense of staying in bed for twenty-four hours, he had seen do harm; it was applicable as a therapeutic agent only in cases of extrema neurasthenia in exhausted conditions, such as the puerperal state, and in those suffering from bodily diseases and exhausted from over-exertion. Dr. Batty Tuke referred to the condition of the brain cells found in the honey bee in the evening after a hard day's work, contrasted with the conditions which are seen in the morning, and maintained that what is wanted in the treatment of the insane is to give rest, so that the congestion may be diminished, and the cell re-nourished and return to its original condition. He quoted statistics of 40 cases of incipient insanity, half of whom recovered within three weeks, and the rest within six weeks, under his treatment.

The PRESIDENT, and Drs. RAYNER, BLANDFORD, RIVERS, COOKE, DRAPES, YELLOWLEES, ANDRIEZEN, URQUHART, SAVAGE, CONOLLY NORMAN, and ROBERTSON discussed the papers, the conclusion being come to that the means of treatment are to be used with reference to the individual patient; and Dr. CLOUSTON replied.

Dr. TURNBULL read a paper entitled Some Remarks on the Forcible Feeding of the Insane. He was of opinion that it was a mistake to wait until the patient became exhausted, and thought the best apparatus for feeding was the œsophageal tube.

The PRESIDENT, Drs. BRISCOE, DRAPES, CLOUSTON, YELLOWLEE, MACDONALD, MERSON, ROBERTSON, URQUHART, COOKE, CARLYLE JOHNSTONE, HAYES NEWINGTON, FINEGAN, OUTTERSON WOOD, TUKE, A. S. NEWINGTON, GRAMSHAW, and SOUTAR discussed the paper; and Dr. TURNBULL replied.

Dr. W. F. ROBERTSON read a paper On the Pathology of Milkiness, Thickening, and Opacity of the Pia-Arachnoid in the Insane, and exhibited numerous microscopical specimens as an illustration to the paper.

Dr. SHUTTLEWORTH read a paper on Provision for Pauper Idiots and Imbeciles. He referred to the want of accommodation for this class of cases, and mentioned that besides the rat-supported institution at Darenth, there were in England only five other training schools, which were all kept up by voluntary contributions. A block for idiots had been erected at the Northampton Asylum, and similar blocks were contemplated at two other asylums, but further accommodation was urgently needed. He advocated the erection of institu-

tions, if necessary, by a combination of counties, or the erection of separate blocks in connection with the existing county or borough asylums.

Dr. FLETCHER BEACH made some remarks on the paper.

Dr. CLOUSTON read for Dr. BRUCE a paper on Thyroid Feeding. The author advocated its use in (1) cases of melancholia whose improvement had been arrested; (2) cases of mania showing signs of dementia; and (3) cases of stupor at an early stage, in which the effect was to wake them up. The treatment had also been tried on general paralytics, and on demented of forty years' duration. Burroughs and Wellcome's 5-grain tabloids were used, but the heart's action had to be watched and the patient kept in bed all the time, in case of heart failure.

Dr. DAWSON read a paper on a Very Rare Case of Echy-mosis following Insane Excitement, which was discussed by the PRESIDENT, Dr. URQUHART, and Dr. T. W. McDOWALL.

On July 26th the annual dinner took place at the Hôtel Métropole, Dr. NICOLSON, President, in the chair. The loyal and patriotic toasts having been duly honoured, the toast of "The Medico-Psychological Association" was proposed by the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, who remarked that in the course of the present century enormous steps had been taken in the humane treatment of lunatics. He was glad to hear that the Association had specially taken in hand the training and education of competent nurses and attendants on the insane. The PRESIDENT responded. Other toasts followed.

On July 27th the President invited the members to Broadmoor, where the wards and manner of treatment of the patients were fully described.

On the following Monday the members paid a visit to the Holloway Sanatorium, on the invitation of Dr. Rees Philipps, some of the members afterwards paying a visit to Windsor.

Dr. and Mrs. Chambers gave a garden party at the Priory, Roehampton, on July 30th, thus closing a very interesting and successful meeting.

## THE CASE OF MR. R. B. ANDERSON.

On August 29th, at the House of Commons, Mr. Cohen, M.P., Mr. Dalziel, M.P., Mr. Albert Lewis, M.P., Mr. McKenna, M.P., and Mr. W. Jones, M.P., received a deputation from the Civil Rights Defence Committee, consisting of the President (the Earl of Stamford), Major-General G. F. I. Graham, Mr. A. Ross Clyne, Mr. W. C. Copeland, Mr. Greenbergh, Mr. H. Anderson (the solicitor to the Committee), Dr. Ward Cousins (President of Council), and Mr. Francis Fowke (General Secretary of the British Medical Association), and Mr. R. B. Anderson, with reference to the judicial injuries sustained by Mr. R. B. Anderson, and the civil rights of medical men and British subjects involved in them.

The EARL OF STAMFORD, in introducing the deputation, said that Mr. R. B. Anderson had been subjected in Tobago to what had been officially characterised as a judicial persecution, and had been unable to obtain any redress. The primary purpose for which the Civil Rights Defence Committee was formed was to enable Mr. Anderson to make an appeal to the Privy Council against the illegal judgments of the Colonial Court given in his case, which he had not yet been able to do for lack of funds. Mr. Anderson had also sought to gain redress by bringing an action for damages against the judges. A Middlesex jury found a verdict for him, and awarded him £500 damages, but Lord Chief Justice Coleridge directed that a verdict should be entered for the defendants on the ground that no action could lie against a judge for acts done in his judicial capacity. The judgment was affirmed by the Court of Appeal, and, in order to exhaust all his legal remedies, Mr. Anderson now wished to push on an appeal to the House of Lords. It might be readily gathered that the question to be brought before the House of Lords involved very grave problems indeed, including the doctrine of judicial immunity, and hence there was need of awakening far more public interest and sympathy than had hitherto been awakened, and forming a strong *committée* to deal with those very grave and important questions. Lord Stamford said he would like to bear emphatic testimony to the *bona fides* of the movement, and to dis-

possess the minds of any whom he could influence of the idea that Mr. Anderson was a mere agitator and a disagreeably pertinacious man, who was pressing forward claims which were not justified by the actual facts. Mr. Anderson was in need of very much more practical support and sympathy than he had yet been able to secure, and he and his friends would value very much the assistance of older Parliamentary hands to advise him as to the exact manner of pressing his claims upon Parliament and upon the public generally. His lordship mentioned that he had received letters from Mr. H. M. Stanley, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Leigh, and Bishop Michinson, regretting their inability to attend with the deputation.

Major-General G. F. I. GRAHAM read an address setting forth the facts of the case; the illegal judgments of the West Indian courts, under which Mr. Anderson was committed to prison and refused a writ of habeas corpus; the result of the investigations of the Royal Commission in 1892; the action brought by Mr. Anderson in England, in which the jury gave him a verdict for £500, but upon which verdict Lord Coleridge entered judgment for the defendant, on the ground that an action did not lie against a judge; and the confirmation of Lord Coleridge's decision by the Court of Appeal, there being at the time Lord Esher pronounced such confirmation an action of a similar nature pending against him, so that the judgment he then pronounced might and did become a precedent in his own favour in his own action. The address stated that the Committee had been advised that his lordship was rendered incompetent by reason of interest to adjudicate in Mr. Anderson's case, and that the decision was not a valid one according to the law of England. As the Committee was advised, the judgment as it stood was a formal declaration that for acts, however illegal, in direct violation of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, depriving the subject of his right to earn his living by his calling or profession, depriving him of his lawful charges for work and services, inflicting penal damages upon him for the lawful exercise of his calling or profession, and maliciously and contrary to Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights enforcing those illegal judgments by illegal imprisonment, by the imposition of excessive bail which Lord Coleridge called "unmitigated unlawful tyranny," and by every species of oppression, including malicious criminal prosecution for petitioning the Sovereign, the subject had no right of remedy whatever. If that were the law, the Committee would urge that in the interest of the rights and liberties of the individual it was necessary that some remedy for such abuses, and some redress for such wrongs, should be devised, including redress for Mr. Anderson, who had at great disadvantage so long maintained an unequal contest in defence of rights that were of common and mutual interest to himself, to his profession, and to every British subject. The Committee appealed with confidence to the representatives of the people in Parliament to co-operate with the Committee in the movement for the defence of those ancient and invaluable rights and liberties.

Mr. COHEN, M.P., said that although it would be folly to conceal that Mr. Anderson's action was incidentally for the purpose of obtaining redress for those wrongs, he (Mr. Cohen) considered he was doing a public and national service in vindicating the rights of a British subject against persecution, by whomsoever levelled. He knew sufficient law to be aware that a judge was, and ought to be, protected, and occupied a position of impregnable immunity for any action which he committed in his judicial capacity; but was that to be interpreted for the first time as a protection and as an immunity against actions which it was a perversion of terms to call, in any sense of the word, judicial?

Mr. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Cohen, for that expression, which will live in our history.

Mr. COHEN, continuing, said he had risen from a perusal of what he was sure was a straightforward, unexaggerated statement of the case, with the conviction that Mr. Anderson was standing up, not so much for the vindication of his own rights, but for the vindication of the rights of the British subject—and the fact that it was at a remote portion of the globe made his action all the more public-spirited—for protection against acts which would be properly described as outrageous were they brought to the light of public criticism. He felt sure that such things could not take place in England.

Mr. Anderson was entitled to all the support and assistance which he could possibly obtain for the vindication of his rights and the prosecution of his litigation. Personally he (Mr. Cohen) was afraid he was a little too much occupied to offer any very active co-operation, but as far as he was able he should consider it a privilege to associate himself with any steps which Mr. Anderson's advisers might suggest should be taken. One of the most energetic and competent persons to associate himself with the matter was Mr. Dalziel, and he welcomed his presence on that account, and should be glad to support him whenever he liked to bring those wrongs under the notice of Parliament.

Mr. ANDERSON thanked Mr. Cohen for his kindness in being present, and also for the way he had expressed himself on the subject.

Mr. DALZIEL, M.P., said that it was most unfortunate that such a time should have been chosen for the deputation to attend, as it was the most important period of the day in the House. He would be compelled to leave almost immediately, but would like to say that he should be glad to examine into all the aspects of the case. It was not exactly a good period of the session to go into big questions, and he would suggest, as a practical outcome of the conference, that a small committee of the Civil Rights Defence Committee, consisting of four or five members, should be appointed to consult with members of Parliament, after all the facts of the case had been mastered by them.

It was agreed that such a conference should be held at an early date.

Mr. MCKENNA, M.P., Mr. W. JONES, M.P., and Mr. ALBERT LEWIS, M.P., promised their support in the matter, and apologised for having to leave.

Mr. ANDERSON having thanked the members for their attendance,

Dr. WARD COUSINS, President of Council of the British Medical Association, stated that the members of that Association generally took a deep interest in the case, and desired to express their extreme sympathy with Mr. Anderson for the wrongs which he had experienced in the past, and felt that the injustice which had been done him was really a disgrace to British administration. There were many questions involved in the case which affected the medical profession as a whole, among them being their right to determine how their services should be administered, and their right to retire under circumstances when they thought retirement was desirable. He was quite sure that the questions involved in Mr. Anderson's case deeply affected the whole medical profession and its rights and privileges, but they went further still, and touched the civil rights of every British subject. There was no doubt that the sympathy which Mr. Anderson had received from the medical profession would strengthen his case, and ultimately lead to a victorious issue. Already the Council of the British Medical Association had passed resolutions in which they desired to express their great regret at the treatment Mr. Anderson had received in Tobago, and they had authorised the JOURNAL to be used for the purpose of ventilating his case. The Branches of the Association had also taken up Mr. Anderson's case, and many subscriptions, he believed, had been forwarded to the Committee. He hoped that the sympathy arising throughout the length and breadth of the Association would greatly aid in carrying on the work, which not only touched Mr. Anderson, but touched the whole of the medical profession. The medical men at Tobago, he believed, also deeply sympathised with Mr. Anderson, and the most eminent members of the profession had taken an interest in the case. Mr. Anderson was well known to the medical profession, and was a distinguished member of it, being a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and also holding medals for distinguished examinations. He had practised very largely and for many years in the Colonies, and had held most important Colonial appointments, and had been a Justice of the Peace. He (Dr. Ward Cousins) felt that the battle which Mr. Anderson was fighting was one in which he had the sympathy of the whole medical profession. The action of the profession had been somewhat slow; it was, he thought, generally slow in moving, even in the right direction, but the British Medical Association was a large body of men, and he could assure Mr. Anderson that he had their entire sympathy. He hoped the

few words he had had the honour to say, as representing the British Medical Association, would be of some little service to Mr. Anderson in his fight.

Lord STAMFORD said the meeting had been one of the utmost importance in the vindication of the rights of Mr. Anderson and the great rights which lay behind Mr. Anderson's case. They were particularly thankful to Dr. Ward Cousins, holding the position he did, for having, as it were, thrown the whole weight of the medical profession behind Mr. Anderson. The assurance of that support was a great comfort and strength to the committee.

The proceedings then closed.

At a meeting of the Civil Rights Defence Committee on September 2nd the following resolutions were passed:

That the thanks of the Civil Rights Defence Committee be, and they are hereby, tendered to Messrs. Benjamin L. Cohen, M.P., James H. Dalziel, M.P., W. Jones, M.P., J. Herbert Lewis, M.P., and Reginald McKenna, M.P., for their reception of a deputation of this Committee on Thursday, August 29th, 1895, at the House of Commons, to Dr. Ward Cousins, as President of Council of the British Medical Association, for the very welcome assurances of entire sympathy and hearty support which he gave on behalf of the Association; to Mr. Cohen for the forcible and convincing eloquence with which he stated Mr. Anderson's claim to the support of his fellow citizens on the ground that he is vindicating rights which are of general and common interest to every British subject, and in which he assured the deputation of his very highly appreciated and valued co-operation and support, until the defence of these rights is carried to a successful issue; and to Messrs. Dalziel, Jones, Lewis, and McKenna for the cordial promises of interest and help which, in the short time at their disposal, owing to the incidence of questions in the House, they kindly gave.

That, as a matter of special interest, and as the fullest publicity is essential in order that the members of the British Medical Association, the medical profession, and the general public may be informed of the nature of the questions and of the rights involved in Mr. Anderson's cases and the vast interests which depend upon them, the Editor of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL be asked to give space in his widely-read journal for the above votes of thanks, and to the shorthand reports of the proceedings herewith or as much as possible thereof.

### THE PROBLEM OF VENTILATION.

THE perennial question of ventilation is again upon us. The House of Commons is still not perfectly supplied with pure and invigorating air, and people still grumble at the atmosphere of the underground railway. From what has lately occurred in Parliament, the President of the Board of Trade admits both indictments, but at least, as far as the underground railway is concerned, pleads want of power to compel the company to supply purer air in their tunnels. It seems to us that the difficulty does not lie in want of power in either case, but in want of knowledge. With regard to the House of Commons, we confess this case does not appeal to us as strongly as the case of the Metropolitan Railway, but we note and desire to emphasise the fact that, if the late statement be correct, here is a building which should in every way be perfect in its ventilation, for even at the time of its construction—and this is remarkable—the ventilation was not ignored. Since then, considering the number of experts who from time to time have tried their hands upon it, and the large amount of money they have expended, it is sad to think that it has not reached a state which, if not perfection, is at least beyond that which gives rise to constant complaints.

With regard to the Metropolitan Railway, possibly it is a still more difficult case to deal with, for it is highly probable that the ventilation of the tunnels did not much trouble the engineer who designed them, but it certainly cannot be said that the Company have not been willing to hear and to try, even without compulsion, what experts in ventilation have had to suggest. Whence arise, then, these unhappy failures? It seems to us that the answer is not far to seek. Ventilation rests on a principle so simple and so obvious, that everyone thinks he understands all about it, and feels justified in stating exactly how every case can be dealt with. In fact, as we see every day, there is no end to the number of ventilating experts, each one of whom has a patent cowl or contrivance which is to produce perfect ventilation under all conditions, and each one would with the greatest pleasure draw

out elegant plans of how the air is to circulate and produce a most agreeable atmosphere. But, alas, there always seems to be a difference between the direction which the currents are to take and those which they do take; for instance, in the drawing the air is told distinctly to go upwards, whereas in practice it insists in coming downwards. After all, air does not do this merely to confuse and and bother ventilating experts, but it has certain very definite laws which it is compelled to follow, and as it is not likely to deviate from these laws it only remains for the change to be made on the part of the experts; in a word, the subject of ventilation has to be treated as any other branch of experimental physics. The laws of the flow of gases are now well known, instruments for determining the rate and direction of such flow are at hand, and what is required is that persons who have had a training in science and know how to set about a physical investigation should undertake these problems of ventilation. They will not find them easy of solution; the main principle is simple enough, but each case has its own complication and has to be dealt with on its own merits. Chemical considerations enter the problem in addition to the purely physical ones, and each case becomes a scientific investigation which certainly those who have not had the benefit of a good scientific training are utterly unable to deal with. Scientific men have rather shirked the practical teaching of the subject of ventilation in their laboratories, possibly feeling it a little beneath their dignity, but surely this is not so; it is a physical problem, and one not devoid of pure scientific interest, and at the same time is one of great practical importance.

### ARCHÆOLOGICA MEDICA.

#### XV.—A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TEACHER OF ANATOMY AND SURGERY, DR. ALEXANDER REID.

It is the hard fate of teachers that they are soon forgotten. Few now remember Carpué or Dermott; even the Powers are no longer known to the present generation of medical students, though their years of drudgery are still remembered by practitioners scattered far and wide over the face of the globe. If oblivion has fallen upon the tutors of our own century, how much more deeply must it envelop those of past ages. Dr. Alexander Reid, however, can still be recalled from his obscurity, and a short time is well spent in considering the man and his works, as he was for many years the chief teacher of anatomy and surgery in London.

A cadet of the Reid family of Aberdeen, Rhaedus was born between 1580 and 1590, the third son of the first minister of Banchory. He took his arts degree in the University of Aberdeen, and then proceeded to France to study medicine. He afterwards settled in London, no doubt attracted by the fact that his brother Thomas was Secretary for Latin and Greek to James I, and he became a foreign brother of the Barber-Surgeons Company, perhaps through the good offices of Dr. Matthew Gwinne, to whom the Company were then much indebted. Dr. Gwinne was also a *persona grata* at Court after his successful disputation with Sir William Paddy, "*An frequens suffitus nicotianæ exoticæ sit sanis salubris?*" in which he took the side known to be upheld by King James. On May 28th, 1620, Reid was incorporated M.A. at Oxford, and on the following day he was created M.D. by letters patent from King Charles I. He was admitted a Fellow of the College of Physicians in 1624, and later in that year he was incorporated at Cambridge. He appears to have lived for some time in Little Britain, and on December 28th, 1632, he was appointed a Lecturer upon Anatomy at Barber-Surgeons' Hall in succession to Dr. Andrews, who held the reversion to Harvey's post of Physician at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, although he did not live to occupy the office. Reid lectured at an annual stipend of £20 on every Tuesday throughout the year until 1634. He died early in October, 1641, leaving a considerable sum of money, a part of which he bequeathed to his native universities in Aberdeen.

Reid's works are numerous, and they give us the facts which were taught publicly to students during the first half of the seventeenth century. The teaching of sur-