

clear why "bodily injury" is mentioned in the section, except to indicate that loss of office for any of the causes laid down in this section was to be treated in the same way as if the said loss arose from "bodily injury." Surely, it is not unnatural to imagine that the legislature might intend that where a Poor Law officer was deprived of his office for no fault of his own, but for public reasons, he should receive the same treatment as if he lost the same office on account of bodily injury or disease.

I do not know of any legal decision on this point, and if my view is erroneous the position of the Poor Law officer is worse than I stated it to be in my address to the Metropolitan Relieving Officers' Association.—I am, etc.,

London, N.E., Oct. 16th.

MAJOR GREENWOOD.

THE REPRESENTATIVE MEETING.

SIR,—At the risk of troubling your readers with some ancient history, I must ask to be allowed space in your columns to comment on a certain resolution of the last Representative Meeting, in connexion with which I find that my action has received, for various reasons, much adverse criticism.

As a part of the Report of the Hospitals Committee, Dr. Pope moved the following resolution:

That in the opinion of the Representative Meeting no fresh public medical institution should be opened without previous consultation with the local medical profession through some organized body such as the local Division of the British Medical Association.

Upon which I moved an amendment to omit the words "some organized body such as." As time was pressing I did not make any remarks as to the desirability of the amendment or its meaning, a course I now much regret, as its real object was not grasped by the Representatives; but Dr. Pope's suggestion, in opposing it, that the meaning was to prevent other bodies being consulted was, to judge from the discussion, accepted by the meeting. The resolution as I would have had it amended reads thus:

That in the opinion of the Representative Meeting no fresh public medical institution should be opened without previous consultation with the local medical profession through the local Division of the British Medical Association,

and would seem to be quite unobjectionable and explicit. Neither Dr. Pope nor any other speaker attempted to show how this would prevent any action of any other organized body; indeed, it could not, as, of course, the Association has no control over them, nor over any person or persons who might wish to consult them. Nevertheless, Dr. Pope's suggestion that this prevention was the object of the amendment has been followed here as the correct explanation, and I have been criticized adversely for moving the amendment. The object was to secure that the Divisions should have the opportunity of discussing the desirability of any new public medical institution. I hope other organized bodies will also discuss the question, but would remind my critics that, so far as I know, no other organized body has the machinery to make its opinion of a proposed institution, if unfavourable, of any force in a similar manner to those Divisions which possess the "Bradford rules." Moreover, in many parts of the country there is no semblance of local medical organization apart from Divisions of the Association.

There has recently been started in Birmingham a provident dispensary scheme, which may or may not be a good thing, but about which no organized body was consulted, not even the local General Practitioners' Union, a body which has, for a local one, a very strong organization. It is well known that a considerable number of practitioners objected to the scheme, perhaps a majority, but they were not consulted at all, and therefore had no opportunity of rejecting or improving it. It was with this instance in my mind that I moved the amendment, with the idea of strengthening the hands of the general practitioner, and not with the intention of injuring the Union (of which I am an old official and one of its first members) or any other organized body of the profession.

There is one other point upon which my action has been criticized which is, perhaps, of more general interest, and which is sure to recur in the future in the history of the Representative Meeting. My instructions from the Division were to support the Report of the Hospitals Com-

mittee, and it is contended that the moving of this amendment was an infraction of the instructions. In the letter I quite admit that this was so, but, seeing that the amendment was only intended to increase the power of the Association, which was the trend of the whole report, I believed that in the spirit I did not go farther than my Division was willing that I should.

At any rate, it must be obvious to any Representative who has been instructed by his Division that he must from time to time depart from the letter of his instructions. In which case I trust he will receive from his electorate a generous construction of his transgression.—I am, etc.,

E. D. KIRBY,

Representative of the Central (Birmingham) Division.
Edgbaston, Oct. 19th. British Medical Association.

MUNICIPAL ESTIMATE OF THE VALUE OF MEDICAL SERVICES.

SIR,—At a meeting of the South-West London Medical Society held to-day at Bolingbroke Hospital the enclosed correspondence was brought before the members, and they, feeling that it was a matter which should be brought before the profession at large, asked me to forward it you for early publication.—I am, etc.,

LEONARD S. McMANUS,
October 13th. President, South-West London Medical Society.

Metropolitan Borough of Wandsworth,
Council House, Wandsworth, S.W.,
October 4th, 1909.

Dear Sir,—A Committee of this Council have under consideration the desirability of retaining the services of a medical practitioner in each of the five districts into which the borough is divided to examine the Council's employees who claim sick allowances in cases of accident or illness, and to certify whether or not they are capable of discharging their duties.

Before making a recommendation on the subject to the Council the Committee are desirous of ascertaining the approximate cost of the proposed scheme, and from inquiries which have been made the following appear to be suitable fees for the work:

(a) If the employee attends at the medical practitioner's surgery, 1s. per case for each examination and report.

(b) If the employee is unable to attend at the surgery and the medical practitioner visits him at his home, 2s. 6d. per case for each examination and report.

Wherever possible, the men would be required to attend at the medical practitioner's surgery for the examination, but in some cases it would be necessary for it to take place at the men's homes or elsewhere.

With the view of assisting the Committee in coming to a decision on the subject, I shall be obliged if you will inform me whether you would be willing to undertake the work referred to in the district No. 1, shown on the enclosed map, on the terms above mentioned. Kindly return the map when you reply.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

HEN. GEO. HILLS,
Town Clerk.

Dr. B. Duke.

REPLY.

Windmill House, Clapham Common,
October 11th, 1909.

Dear Sir,—While thanking you for so kindly submitting to me the list of fees offered by the Council for examining and certifying their employees, I must respectfully decline such a tempting offer. I can only regret the Council have such a contemptible opinion of the value of a medical man's time.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

B. DUKE.

Henry Geo. Hills, Esq.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE MEDICAL SCHOOLS OF LONDON.

SIR,—Mr. Wallis, when opening the session at Charing Cross Hospital, utilized his opportunity to set forth his views concerning London University in a very drastic manner; but many who read his speech, and also your article on the same subject, must absolutely disagree with the views there expressed, and it behoves the graduates and undergraduates of the university who have attained their relative positions with considerable extra study and self-sacrifice, to resist with all their energy any lowering of the standard of what is recognized as one of the "higher qualifications."

The view is absolutely wrong that accuses the matriculation examination of being the cause of the relatively increasing popularity of provincial universities. I speak with the authority of one who was educated at a provincial university as an external student for the London degree.