

PART IV.—NOTES AND NEWS.

MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

A meeting of the Association, being an adjournment of the Annual Meeting, was held on February 15th, 1894, at the Randolph Hotel, Oxford, under the presidency of Dr. Murray Lindsay.

The PRESIDENT said the meeting, as they were all aware from the notices they had received, was an adjournment of the Annual Meeting for the special purpose of further considering the report of the Rules Committee, a report which had involved a very large expenditure of time, labour, and patience, which he felt sure they cordially recognized. He had no doubt their deliberations that day would be smooth and harmonious, because they were all animated by the same spirit, that of doing the best they could for the interests of the Association. They would proceed at once to business.

After considerable discussion it was held that the present meeting had power to finally deal with the rules as it thought fit.

CHAPTER I. (CONSTITUTION).

Rules 1, 2, and 3 were passed.

On the suggestion of the PRESIDENT it was decided to deal only with the parts of the rules printed in italics, with the understanding that verbal alterations not involving the alteration of any principle might also be made.

On the consideration of Rule 4, Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN moved, "To substitute the word 'general' for 'a' in clause (2), and to omit 'and Divisional' from clause (3) of the same rule.

Dr. MERCIER said that in drafting the rules, the Rules Committee had the instructions of the Association before them for divisions, and these divisions were to be practically upon the basis of the present Irish and Scotch branches. At present the Irish and Scotch branches had power to elect members to their Association, and it was felt they could not deprive the new divisions of that power of electing members without at the same time depriving the Irish and Scotch branches of that power. It seemed to him impossible to deprive the Irish and Scotch branches of this privilege which they had enjoyed for a very long time.

Dr. SHUTTLEWORTH asked whether the Irish and Scotch branches had power to elect an English member. For instance, supposing he were a candidate wishing to join the Association, could he be elected by sending his name to Edinburgh or Dublin.

The PRESIDENT—I fancy that was never contemplated and practically never done.

Dr. SHUTTLEWORTH pointed out that the proposed rule left no option, and a man might get elected by a northern who was unpopular in his own district in the south.

The PRESIDENT said that no doubt the spirit of the clause was meant to apply only to local candidates, and he did not think any attempt would be made to get a candidate elected by a side wind as had been suggested.

Dr. ERNEST WHITE seconded the amendment, and said it would help them to remove a privilege which had been enjoyed by Scotch and Irish members, as he thought the time had come when all members of the Association should be elected by the general body of the Association.

Dr. WEATHERLY said that one of the objects of having these divisional meetings, so far as he understood Dr. Macdonald and Dr. Rayner, was that these divisions should try as much as they could to whip up new members, and it was a very great point, in discussing the rules, in the Rules Committee, that the

divisions should have power to elect members. He certainly thought that the rule adopted in the British Medical Association should also be adopted in their own Association, that the candidates should be elected by the divisions, but not become members until their names had been brought before the general meeting, but he was overruled in that, and it was definitely decided that the divisions should have the power of electing members, and when elected they should be members of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland. He quite agreed with what Dr. Shuttleworth had said, that it was open to objection unless they gave the name of a definite Secretary, because an objectionable member might try and get elected in a division in which he is not known.

Dr. Conolly Norman's amendment was then put and carried by ten votes to nine.

Dr. WEATHERLY challenged the vote. He would propose that the votes be taken down in writing.

A division was then taken by each member writing his name for or against the amendment, as follows:—For: Drs. Spence, Mould, White, Finigan, R. Baker, J. Merson, Conolly Norman, Savage, Fox, Seymour Tuke. Against: Drs. Hack Tuke, J. A. Ewan, Morrison, Fletcher Beach, Murray Lindsay, Percy Smith, Shuttleworth, Whitcombe, Mercier, Weatherly, Newington, Richards.

The PRESIDENT declared the amendment lost by 12 votes to 10.

Dr. WEATHERLY proposed that in clause (2), instead of "a Secretary" it should read "the General Secretary, or the Secretary of the division in which the candidate resides."

Agreed to.

Dr. MORRISON, on the consideration of clause 3, asked whether the notices were to go round to the entire body of the Association, or were they to be limited to the members of the division?

Dr. NEWINGTON said there was a principle involved in this. If the notice was sent round to every member of the Association as at the last meeting, it obviously meant an invitation to the whole of the members to attend the divisional meeting. The question was whether the divisional meeting should be the property of the division itself or the property of the Association generally.

A MEMBER pointed out that there was nothing before the meeting. A gentleman had raised a question, but no amendment had been moved.

A MEMBER thereupon proposed that the word "and" between "general" and "divisional" should read "or," but this met with no seconder, and consequently fell to the ground.

On Rule 5, Dr. SPENCE said that even supposing they gave power to the divisions to elect members, the members of the Association at large ought to have the opportunity of seeing the names of the men proposed for election, so that if by any chance, which was an improbable thing, objection was taken to any name, members of another division or those who did not attend the general meetings might have an opportunity of entering a protest.

Dr. MORRISON said he should like to have some definition of what was a general meeting and what was a divisional meeting.

The PRESIDENT—Chapter IV. gives all the details about meetings.

Dr. WEATHERLY thought they might stop the discussion if they gave power to divisions to elect members, but before they became absolute members of the Association their names should be referred to the General Council for confirmation.

Dr. MERCIER proposed that Rule 5 stand part of the Rules of the Association, which on a show of hands was agreed to.

On Rule 7, Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN said he would like to know when anyone was elected a member of the Association at a divisional meeting, whether he remained a member of the same division in case of his changing his residence? Did he become a member of another division supposing he went into it, or did he remain a member of the original division?

Dr. PERCY SMITH—I apprehend when a member is elected he has a right to attend any meeting. There is no question about it.

Dr. MERCIER submitted that this question did not arise under this rule, and he would propose that Rule 7 be carried.

This was agreed to.

On Rule 10, Dr. PERCY SMITH proposed “That the words ‘Honorary, Corresponding, and Ordinary’ should be inserted between the words ‘and’ and ‘members’ in the previous line.”

Agreed to.

On Rule 19, Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN said the wording of the rule would seem to include the power of voting by honorary members on questions connected with the internal policy of the Association. They might vote upon questions of finance and discuss the rules. Surely that was not intended?

Dr. NEWINGTON proposed the omission of the words “powers and” in the second line, and all the words after “voting” in the third line.

Agreed to.

On Rule 20, Dr. PERCY SMITH proposed to insert the words “and Colonial” after “Foreign,” and the omission of the words “engaged in lunacy practice and” in the first line; and the insertion of the words “of such members” after “number” in the last line.

Agreed to.

On Rule 23, Dr. HACK TUKE proposed to insert in the first line after “shall” the words “be exempt from all payments to the Association, and shall.”

Agreed to.

On Rule 24, Dr. HACK TUKE said he had not the slightest wish to enlarge the scope of the divisional meetings, but the words “scientific investigation” did not seem to him quite enough for what they were all prepared to allow the divisions to discuss. He would therefore propose that the rule should read, “There shall be divisions of the Association for promoting its objects as set forth in Rule 2.”

Agreed to.

On Rule 25, a MEMBER suggested that the numbers be a majority of two-thirds of the members present at the meeting when the matter was brought under discussion.

Dr. MERCIER thought it would be most unfortunate to pass anything of the kind, and that it would be far better to leave the matter in the hands of the Council, who were elected for the purpose of managing the business of the Association.

The rule was passed without alteration.

On Rule 27, Dr. WHITE proposed to insert after “Association” in the second line the words “After a list of candidates for election has been sent to every member of the Association.”

Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN seconded.

Dr. MERCIER said he must confess he did not understand this extreme jealousy as to the admission of members into the Association. They were assured that the constitution of these divisions would be a source of enormous increase of the members of the Association, and that was one of the strongest arguments put forward at the last meeting in favour of the formation of divisions. Now it seemed that they were so afraid the influx of members would be so enormous as to swamp them altogether, that they must raise barriers against their admission. He thought it would be unwise to raise any needless restrictions in the way of admissions of new members, and as he considered Dr. White’s amendment would cause a needless restriction he hoped the Association would reject it.

Dr. WHITE—I rise in the spirit of not desiring to place any barrier whatever upon the election of members. I think that in the election of members of an Association like ours the names of the candidates should be generally known to

the members of the Association, and that is all that we ask for. We merely ask that a little list shall be sent round to each member of the Association of the candidates for election.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said the subject had been thoroughly considered by the Rules Committee, and the general feeling of the Committee was that the divisions, when constituted, should have the power to elect members, and he believed that was the general opinion also of the last meeting they held upon the rules.

The amendment was put and lost, five voting for and ten against it.

Dr. HACK TUKE proposed the insertion of the words "hold its meetings" between "to" and "choose" in the first line, and the omission of all the words after "business" in the third line.

Agreed to.

Dr. MORRISON proposed to insert the words "to elect its own Secretary" after "Association" in the third line, and said the whole discussions in connection with the divisional branches were carried on in the spirit of electing their own Secretaries.

Dr. WEATHERLY seconded, and thought it was absolutely absurd that the General Association should have a voice in the election of a Divisional Secretary. Whether the name of the Secretary should be brought before the Council for confirmation was a question for the meeting to discuss. If they were going to allow divisions to be formed were they going to say that the members composing that division were not fit and proper persons to elect their Secretary? Were they to be dictated to by persons who had no interest in their division?

Dr. NEWINGTON said at the last meeting it was decided that the Secretary of each division should be *ex-officio* a member of the Council. Hitherto the Council had been elected entirely by the Association, with an opportunity at the Annual Meeting of suggesting more suitable persons. But according to this amendment, conjoined with another rule afterwards, the division would elect its Secretary straight into the Council. A point he made at the last meeting was this, that if they were going to allow any division, such as Scotland and Ireland, with less than 50 members, to elect a member of the Council by sending its Secretary, it followed in justice that every 50 members in England should have the same power. If this was logically carried out, there being 300 members in England, there ought to be six English divisions, each electing a member of the Council in the shape of a Secretary. The question was, what was the balance of convenience to the Association? Was it convenient that the five divisions now proposed should be extended to eight or ten? The committee foresaw the difficulty, and as a sort of compromise it was decided that they should suggest that instead of the absurdity of having six English divisions, with all the machinery of six ballotings for Divisional Secretaries, the Divisional Secretary should be "an officer" of the Association, and that it should be an understood thing that, as in Scotland and Ireland the wishes of the Scotch and Irish had been faithfully observed, means should be taken by the Council to see who would be a proper person to appoint for any branch in England. That was the scheme, and he thought it was an extremely fair one.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said that as a member of the Rules Committee he was bound to stick to the rules, but he would suggest to Dr. Morrison that probably it would meet the views of the opponents of his amendment if he would be satisfied with making a recommendation to the Council.

Dr. WEATHERLY said he would be satisfied with that, but his object was to prevent any other divisions having an absolute voice in the election of Secretary for the particular division.

Dr. MORRISON—Is the election to take place except upon vote?

Dr. WEATHERLY—The division sends up the name of the Secretary, and that is to be confirmed by the Council.

Dr. MORRISON—The man elected by the Council may be thoroughly popular with the Council, but very unpopular in the Division.

Dr. SHUTTLEWORTH asked whether there was any valid reason why the Divisional Secretary should be a member of the Council. That practice was not pursued in the British Medical Association, and why should it be so with their Association.

Dr. MERCIER—Simply because it was passed at the last meeting.

Dr. SHUTTLEWORTH thought the principle of centralization would be kicked against, certainly by the northern people, and he thought it was a bad one.

Dr. WEATHERLY said that in the British Medical Association the Secretary was certainly not an *ex-officio* member of the Council, but each division had power to elect a member of the Council. In their own Association they thought the Secretary was the right and proper person to be an *ex-officio* member of Council, and any analogy drawn from the British Medical Association was a false one.

The PRESIDENT remarked that strong representations had been made to him on the lines of Dr. Weatherly. There was a strong feeling that way, and it was common sense.

Dr. EWAN said it seemed absurd that the divisions should have no power to elect their own Secretary. Why should they in the south-west get an Honorary Secretary appointed by the Council who probably did not know the individual members of that division?

Mr. RICHARDS suggested that the different divisions should not elect their own Secretary, but submit a name for confirmation at the Annual Meeting.

Dr. MORRISON said he wished to answer Dr. Newington, whose great objection to the Secretary being elected by the divisions was that the franchise was unequally distributed. Did Dr. Newington change the franchise by having the Secretary elected as he suggested? He would propose as an addition to the rule "That each division shall recommend to the Council, after taking a vote of the division, the name of a member to act as the Secretary which the Council will accept."

Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN—That is to say each division shall send forward a name to the Council, with a mandatory order that the Council shall elect. That gives the Council no power. I think it is monstrous that such a proposal should be made.

Dr. MORRISON—Why should the Council have this particular power of throwing out any popular man? Practically, the Council has the power to nominate him and elect him.

Dr. MERCIER—No, no; the Association elects him.

Dr. MORRISON—Supposing the Association does not elect him? We should be at a deadlock.

Dr. FOX protested against the wording of the amendment, and Dr. MORRISON agreed that it should read as follows:—"That each division will recommend to the Council, after taking a vote of the division, the name of a member to act as the Secretary, which the Council will consider."

Dr. WEATHERLY seconded this, and it was carried *sem. con.*

Dr. EWAN proposed to insert "and Secretary" after the word "Chairman" in the second line.

Not agreed to.

The rule as amended was then passed.

On Rule 29, Dr. SPENCE said he should like to ask the Secretary of the Rules Committee a question which he had put to him privately, and he told him he was unable to answer it—(laughter)—that was to say, had members of the Northern Division the right to attend meetings of the South-Western or South-Eastern Divisions?

The PRESIDENT—That question came up in conversation to-day, and it was thought Yes.

Dr. MERCIER—It has never been settled. It is a very important question.

Dr. SPENCE—For the purpose of settling the question I will move the addition: "That meetings of each division be open to every member of the Association."

The PRESIDENT—I think that is the general feeling.

Mr. RICHARDS—I don't think it is the general feeling. Members of one division might go down and swamp another division.

The PRESIDENT—They will only take part in the scientific discussion.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said he presumed, and thought every member of the Association had the same feeling, that they were at liberty as individual members to belong to a division or not, as they liked; just as in the British Medical Association, a man might be a member of the Association and not necessarily a member of a branch.

Dr. SPENCE amended his rider as follows:—"That all members of the Association have a right to attend any of the divisional meetings, and take part in all business of the meetings save such as refers to the internal management of the division."

Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN seconded.

Dr. Spence's rider was then put and carried.

Dr. EWAN proposed the insertion of the word "other" between "the" and "meetings" in the second line.

Agreed to.

Dr. SAVAGE proposed "That notices of all meetings other than special shall be sent with list of names of candidates for membership to the Editors of the Journal for publication."

Agreed to.

On Rule 30, Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN said he wished to ask whether every member residing in a division would be responsible for the expenditure, because as far as he could see unless that was done there would be a money premium put upon members not belonging to a division. Members of the Association not belonging to any division would apparently be free from expense, and it would be an inducement to members who at present did not attend the meetings to continue in their evil course.

Dr. MERCIER said the intention of the Rules Committee was simply to carry out loyally the instructions they received from the Association. Individually, they were all against it, and thought the divisions should pay for their own expenditure; but they were afraid if they proposed such a rule as that that it would immediately be said, "Oh, you are trying to smash the thing; you have accepted this resolution nominally, and now you are destroying it in detail, and you are placing upon us expenses that we cannot bear, and you intend to upset the apple-cart altogether." Therefore the Committee laid this burden upon the unattached members rather than upon the members of the divisions in order that it might be shown that they intend to carry out loyally the intention of the Association.

After some further discussion the rule was passed without alteration.

CHAPTER II. (OFFICERS).

On Rule 2, Dr. MERSON said as the rule stood the power of voting for all officers was confined to members present at the Annual Meeting. He understood from what took place at the last meeting that the principle was settled that all members of the Association should have the power, if they liked to exercise it, of voting for officers as well as for the Council. ("No, no.") If that was not so, he begged to propose as an amendment that after the words "that meeting," in the third line, should be inserted "or voting by paper as provided for in Rule 7 for the election of members of Council."

Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN seconded the amendment, which was supported by Dr. MORRISON.

Dr. NEWINGTON said that in the year he had the honour of presiding over

the Association this question was distinctly raised. It was felt that for the superior offices of the Association the Council could very well ascertain the feeling of the Association as to who would be fit and proper persons for the incoming year, and anything like rivalry or fighting in respect of those offices was to be deprecated.

Dr. MERCIER said the arrangement in the rules was the result of a very long and animated discussion in the Rules Committee, and it was a compromise which all members of the Rules Committee were bound to support, and which he thought would work very well. He might say he was one of its opponents in the Rules Committee, but at the same time he had been to a considerable extent converted, and he believed it was the best arrangement for the Association.

The amendment was put and lost, and Rule 2 was passed.

On Rule 17, Dr. SPENCE proposed to insert after the word "divisions," in the second line, "and shall send notices of such meetings to the Editor of the Journal, in accordance with Rule 29, Chap. I."

Agreed to.

CHAPTER III. (THE COUNCIL).

On Rule 4, Dr. MORRISON thought the rule, if put into operation, would operate very strictly against assistant medical officers; it would be rather a hardship upon them.

Dr. WHITCOMBE said there was no intention on the part of the Rules Committee to do any such thing, and he would propose to substitute for the words "four successive meetings of the Council," "at least one meeting of the Council during the year."

Agreed to.

On Rule 6, Dr. HACK TUKE said that Dr. Rayner had intended to propose an amendment to this rule, but unfortunately he was prevented being there, and had requested him to propose in his name the addition of these words to Rule 6: "Together with the names of one nominee from each division for membership on the Council, such nomination to be made at the Divisional Meeting and forwarded to the General Secretary." Dr. Rayner wished him to say that the sending out of a blank form would lead to unsatisfactory results, would be unfair in many respects, and that on the whole the difficulty would be met by having these nominations.

Dr. WHITE said that this proposal involved the whole principle of election. The Committee had been very carefully into Rule 6, and it was the only practical way in which the question could be settled.

Dr. MERCIER pointed out that a vote on this point had been taken and lost at the preceding meeting, in which the President concurred.

Dr. HACK TUKE withdrew the amendment.

Dr. SPENCE said he would like to stick to the old plan, but he would give the entire body of the Association power, by sending them a list of names a month before the meeting, of putting their pens through one or two of the six and substituting such men as they thought would be better suited. That would be proxy voting, and would save the Council the ignominy on the day of election of finding they had abundant papers without a single name put on any one. For the purpose of bringing this matter to some sort of conclusion, he would propose that the following be added to Rule 6: "That the names of six gentlemen to fill the vacancies on the Council be placed on the nomination list by the Council, such list to be furnished to all members one month before the Annual Meeting, so that any member may be able to delete the name, or names, of any or all of the proposed members and substitute the name or names of any other member or members of the Association whose consent to serve has been received."

Dr. WHITE seconded, and said he foresaw very great difficulties and very doubtful elections to the Council if the present system was carried out. He

could imagine there would be many instances of blank forms received, and also one or two facetious nominations which would be hardly acceptable, yet for want of sufficient guidance these nominations might be successful, and might tend to bring discredit upon the Association. He was perfectly certain the old system was the only one which they would find would work in the future.

Dr. NEWINGTON said he was quite in sympathy with what Dr. Spence and Dr. White had said, and had seen from the first that mischief would follow throughout the proposed nominations, which resolution, he believed, was founded on an utter mistake.

Dr. MERCIER pointed out that the whole difficulty arose from the inconsiderate rejection at the last meeting of the recommendation of the Rules Committee that there should be a nomination in every case, that the nomination should not come from the Council, but from any two members of the Association at large. The Rules Committee at the same time provided a form of nomination in which the member nominating undertook that his nominee was able and willing to fulfil the duties of a Councillor.

Dr. Spence's rider was put to the meeting, and carried by more than two to one.

On putting the rule with the addition as a substantive motion, Dr. NEWINGTON proposed an amendment that it should be stated that any member present at an Annual Meeting could substitute a name for that on the nomination paper in respect of any office, which was carried.

Rules 7 to 14 were passed.

On the proposition of Dr. MORRISON, seconded by Dr. WHITCOMBE, it was decided to add the words "*pro tem.*" to Rule 15; and with this addition the rule was passed.

CHAPTER IV. (MEETINGS).

On Rule 3, Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN proposed as an addition: "And shall at the earliest possible date issue to each member of the Association a circular notifying each member of the forthcoming meeting, and requesting the contribution of papers and other scientific matter therefor." He remarked that it would involve a slight alteration in Rule 4, that was the substitution of "a" for "the" in the first line.

Dr. SAVAGE seconded, and it was carried.

Rule 4 was amended as above.

On Rule 8, Dr. MERCIER thought £50 was far-too large a sum, and he moved that it be reduced £10. He remarked that it was impossible for the Association to stand the financial strain upon it if they went on as they had been going on in the past.

This was put and lost.

Dr. WHITE proposed that the sum be reduced to £25, which was carried.

CHAPTER V. (COMMITTEES).

Rules 1 to 10 were passed *en bloc*.

APPENDIX TO RULES (III. THE GASKELL PRIZE).

On the proposition of Dr. HACK TUKE, it was decided that the heading to this section should read- "III. The Gaskell Prize and Medal (value £30)."

APPENDIX TO REGULATIONS.

On Form B, Dr. MERCIER said that at present it was not binding on candidates to conform to the regulations of the Association, and in order to make it so, a proviso should be inserted in Form B. He proposed that after the word "agree" in the third line should be inserted the words "to conform to the regulations of the Association, and."

Dr. NEWINGTON said the whole question was discussed at York, and it was finally decided that the matter should be settled in the form as now printed. There was a strong feeling that this certificate and all the provisions should remain untouched.

The amendment was not seconded.

Dr. WHITCOMBE formally moved that the rules as amended be adopted.
 Dr. MERCIER seconded.
 The motion was adopted.

Dr. WHITCOMBE moved that the Secretary be requested to send the amendments to the printer, omitting the word "Proposed" on the title page and the note at the top, and that he be empowered to take legal opinion upon the rules.

Dr. MERCIER seconded.
 The motion was adopted.

The PRESIDENT—In order to let it be clearly known to members who are not here to-day, would it not be better to have a note in the Journal saying that these rules have been passed, and that due notice must be given for any proposed alteration?

Agreed.
 The meeting then terminated.

MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

A General Meeting of the Association was held at four o'clock on Thursday, February 15th, at the Randolph Hotel, Oxford, Dr. James Murray Lindsay being in the chair.

The SECRETARY read the minutes of the last quarterly meeting, which were confirmed.

The following candidates were elected:—

CHARLES HENRY GWYNN, M.D.Edin., Co-Licencee St. Mary's House, Whitchurch, Salop.

WILLIAM F. FARQUHARSON, M.B.Edin., Assistant Medical Officer, Counties' Asylum, Garlands, Carlisle.

W. LLOYD ANDRIEZEN, M.D.Lond., Pathologist and Assistant Medical Officer, West Riding Asylum, Wakefield.

PERCY J. BAILY, M.B.Edin., Senior Assistant Medical Officer, London County Asylum, Hanwell, W.

HENRY M. CULLIVAN, L.E.C.P.I. and L.E.C.S.I., second Assistant Medical Officer, Richmond District Asylum, Dublin.

DANIEL F. RAMBANT, M.D., Univ.Dubl., Third Assistant Medical Officer and Pathologist, Richmond District Asylum, Dublin.

THOMAS S. MCCLAUGHEY, L.E.C.S.I. and L.A.H.Dubl., Assistant Medical Officer, District Asylum, Maryborough, Ireland.

WILLIAM JAMES VINCENT, M.B.Durh., Assistant Medical Officer, Durham County Asylum.

THE RETIREMENT OF MR. CLEATON.

The PRESIDENT said the next business was a complimentary motion. It seemed only due, and their pleasing duty, to propose something as emanating from that Association with regard to Mr. Cleaton, who had retired from his post as Visiting Member of the Lunacy Commission, a post he had adorned for so many years. (Applause.) Dr. Conolly Norman would propose a motion, which would be seconded by Dr. Savage.

Dr. CONOLLY NORMAN, the President-Elect, proposed—"That this meeting has learnt with regret the retirement of Mr. Cleaton from his post as Visiting Member of the Lunacy Commission, after a long and distinguished service. The Association feels that Mr. Cleaton's kindness and clear judgment have been of the greatest service in his work in the Lunacy Department, and they hope he may live long to enjoy his well-deserved leisure." He remarked that Mr. Cleaton had had a very long service in the Commission, and the universal testi-