

*University of Sheffield.*

Mr. Clement Lucas was appointed representative of the College on the Court of Governors of the above university in place of Mr. A. W. Mayo Robson, whose period of office had expired.

*Royal Commission on University Education.*

The consideration of a letter from the secretaries of the above stating that the Commission will be prepared to receive information regarding the views of the college upon questions connected with medical education in London was referred to a committee.

*Jubilee of the Grant of the Charter enabling the College to confer Diplomas in Dental Surgery.*

It was determined to celebrate the above by a dinner given by the college to the leading members of the dental profession. The dinner will be held in the library of the college on Thursday, December 2nd, 1909.

## CONJOINT BOARD IN SCOTLAND.

THE following candidates have been approved at the examinations indicated:

FIRST EXAMINATION.—A. I. Clarke, J. J. Dykes, G. W. Fleming, D. B. Cama, R. B. Lilly, C. R. C. Moon, J. Warden, A. T. Kuriyan, P. E. O'Donoghue, G. B. Hanna, F. W. C. Hinings, J. J. Reynolds, O. Brunlees.

SECOND EXAMINATION.—G. A. Macvea, M. F. A. L'Hoste, G. I. Secluna, S. Brennan, J. N. Clark, T. Hardie, S. D. Bridge.

THIRD EXAMINATION.—E. Thorp, Emma C. R. Fisher, J. McManus, E. C. Hamilton, C. S. Owen, J. D. Wright, J. M. Dalzell, J. A. Hutchinson.

FINAL EXAMINATION.—F. B. Carvalho, R. A. Barve, R. D. Neagle, H. H. Field-Martell, M. Remere, A. F. Henriques, K. T. Nath, R. A. Hosegood, W. R. MacKenzie, S. Sharples, Beatrice Coxon, G. B. Moon, R. V. Dias, D. B. Gazdar, Maud T. Féré, H. V. A. Gatchell, F. C. Eberhardt.

## CONJOINT BOARD IN IRELAND.

THE following candidates have been approved at the examinations indicated:

FIRST PROFESSIONAL.—J. P. Brennan, B. J. Cusack, J. J. L. Cox, H. A. S. Deane, E. G. Foley, A. B. Foott, R. F. J. Griffith, R. Green, J. F. Lyons, D. McEntire, R. J. May, C. J. O'Carroll, H. V. O'Donoghue, P. Rowan, T. F. Ryan, G. N. Smyth, R. Tivy.

SECOND PROFESSIONAL.—M. J. Ahern, A. J. Best, C. M. G. Campbell, T. J. Kelly, D. Murphy, G. Sheehan, G. A. Shiel, W. Waugh.

**Medico-Legal.**

## WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

## BAKER'S ECZEMA.

A. M. writes: Is there any case on record *re* compensation to a baker for eczema caused by his employment? It commenced about six months ago, and under treatment seemed to be cured, but it returned again a day or two after he had started to work. This is the third or fourth time he has returned to work after the skin seemed to have recovered its normal condition, but on each occasion the eczema has returned after a day or two at work. Is there any case bearing on his legal position for compensation?

## CERTIFICATES IN LUNACY.

J. M.—(1) So far as we are aware, the only cases in which a justice specially appointed under the Lunacy Act, 1890, has to appoint two medical practitioners to certify to alleged lunacy are those which he has to consider under Section 13, Subsection 2, of that Act. (2) In the above described class of cases, even if one of the medical practitioners certifying is not the medical attendant of the patient, it is not clear that there is any legal ground for complaint. (3) We cannot say what is the usual practice for initiating legal proceedings, as it varies in different districts, but we are ready to assume that the provisions of the Lunacy Act are always strictly complied with. (4) Any patient admitted to a public asylum as a pauper, or classified as such on or after admission, can only become classified as a private patient after arrangements have been made for all expenses incurred to be repaid, either from his own resources or by some other means.

## GIFTS TO LOCUMTENENTS.

A CORRESPONDENT states that while acting as locumtenent he was presented with £5 by the father of a patient to whom he had given special attention. Later, when the account was sent in by his principal, the father complained of the charges, and mentioned the present to the locumtenent. The principal has since written asking for the £5. Is he legally entitled to it?

\*.\* Although it is a well-recognized rule in the profession that an assistant or locumtenent must not receive a money present from his principal's patients, in the case of a *bona fide* present he might be legally entitled to retain it. In this instance the patient's father appears to have thought the £5 in a sense a set-off against the principal's charges. In these circumstances it would seem that the money ought to be paid to the principal.

## MEDICAL WITNESSES.

INQUIRER wishes to know whether, if summoned to attend as a witness the police court or assize court to give evidence as to "facts," and he is there asked for an "opinion" on the matter in question, he can claim an expert's fee before giving the said opinion.

\*.\* A medical witness can only raise a question as to his fees before being sworn. After being sworn he must answer all questions put to him which in the opinion of the judge are relevant to the cause being tried.

## THE MIDWIVES ACT.

INDEPENDENT.—(1) Under Section 2 of the Midwives Act, 1902, any woman had the right on application within two years from the date of the Act coming into operation to be certified on producing evidence satisfactory to the Central Midwives Board that, at the passing of the Act, she had been for at least one year in *bona fide* practice as a midwife, and that she bore a good character. The Act came into operation on April 1st, 1903. If a midwife did not obtain certification under the provisions of Section 2, she would by Section 1, paragraph (2), be debarred from practising as a midwife. (2) With regard to our correspondent's other question, we would refer him to a reply published in the JOURNAL of October 9th, p. 1107.

**Obituary.**

## SIR ARTHUR MITCHELL, K.C.B., M.D.,

FORMERLY COMMISSIONER IN LUNACY FOR SCOTLAND.

IN Sir Arthur Mitchell, K.C.B., M.D., who died, as announced last week, in Edinburgh on October 12th, aged 83, has passed away a public official who played a distinguished part in the development of lunacy administration. A Graduate in Medicine of Aberdeen University, he was appointed Deputy Commissioner in Lunacy on the establishment in 1857 of the General Board of Lunacy for Scotland. He was thus present at the very inception of a new order of things which followed upon the Scottish Royal Lunacy Commission's report of 1855. That remarkable document contains the germs of most, if not of all, that has since been done to ameliorate the lot of the insane in Scotland, and Sir James Cox and the other distinguished men who drew it up found in Dr. Mitchell an enthusiastic supporter of all views tending to rescue the insane from neglect, and to free them from needless restrictions on their happiness and liberty which had grown round them during ages of ignorance and superstition, and had been followed by acquiescence in evils supposed to be irremediable.

In the great reformation of lunacy administration and the influx of new ideas which followed the passing of the Lunacy Act of 1857, the part with which Dr. Mitchell was specially identified was to ascertain the condition of the insane under private care and to guide the Board in taking measures necessary for its improvement. After an experience of six years he embodied the results of his efforts in this direction in a book entitled *The Insane in Private Dwellings* (1864), which yet remains the standard book on the subject. It disclosed a painful story of neglect and misery among the insane under private care when he entered on his duties, but it also put on record the steps taken to remedy the evils disclosed; and at the end of a few years after the passing of the Act it showed the system of caring for the insane in private dwellings established upon the satisfactory footing on which it has since rested.

In 1870 he became a Commissioner, and from that time down to his retirement in 1895 he ever showed himself anxious to support and encourage medical superintendents of asylums and others, on whom rested the burden and heat of the day, in all endeavours which held out a promise of promoting the recovery or adding to the happiness of the insane.

Sir Arthur Mitchell was in 1880 a member of the Commission on Criminal Lunacy in England, and greatly influenced the character of the report of that Commission and of the legislation which followed. In 1889 he became Chairman of a Commission to inquire into Lunacy Administration in Ireland, and in that capacity urged measures which have done much towards improving the condition of the insane in that country.