nitrogen of the urine. Clinical comments and dietary suggestions follow each section, and there are chapters on diagnosis of impaired kidney function and the dietary control of disturbances of metabolism. The last chapter is on diabetes, and includes insulin treatment. The methods described are all standard ones, though some have been slightly modified to meet the demands of the clinical laboratory using relatively small quantities of blood. It is questionable whether those to whom this book is dedicated will have either the time or the inclination to perform these tests, but those who are disposed to undertake such work will find it convenient to have the methods collected into one handy book of small compass.

Marriage and Syphilis: A Treatise on Eugenics,¹⁰ by Dr. G. M. KATSAINOS of Boston, U.S.A., has been written from the point of view of the propagandist rather than that of the syphilologist. The author believes that syphilis, in spite of the work of public health departments, voluntary societies, and individual workers, has not yet received the attention that it merits, and in his book he makes a forcible, if somewhat sentimental appeal to his readers. The sentence printed on the fly-leaf sums up his object: "If by this work of mine the procreation of even one syphilitic child is prevented my time, efforts, and expenses have not been in vain."

The Weekly Telegraph Guide to Holiday Resorts,¹¹ a deservedly popular annual which has now reached its twentieth year, contains a brief description in alphabetical order of holiday resorts in England, the Channel Islands, Isle of Wight and Isle of Man, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, with lists of hotels, boarding-houses, and lodgings. A few pages are appended on holiday tours in Belgium.

¹⁰ *Marriage and Syphilis: A Treatise on Eugenics*. By G. M. Katsainos, M.D. Boston: Wright and Potter. 1923. (Med. 8vo, pp. 162; 23 figures. 3 dols.)

¹¹ *The Weekly Telegraph Guide to Holiday Resorts of the United Kingdom and Irish Free State*. Twenty-ninth year of publication. London: "Holiday Guide" Manager, *Weekly Telegraph Office*. 1924. (Med. 8vo, pp. 384; illustrated. 6d.)

MEDICAL AND SURGICAL APPLIANCES.

An Ophthalmoscope Attachment.

Drs. W. O. C. JARRATT and LEONARD P. LOCKHART have devised an ophthalmoscope attachment which they describe as follows: "Owing to the difficulty which many students and practitioners experience in performing ophthalmoscopic examination by the direct method with a Morton's ophthalmoscope, and to the expense entailed by the purchase of an electric instrument, we have devised a simple attachment for the ordinary ophthalmoscope, by means of which it is possible to obtain the advantage of the electrical instrument at a comparatively small cost. It consists of a collar and an adjustable arm which is fitted to the ophthalmoscope at the junction of the handle and the body. The electrical part is of the simplest, being merely a pocket battery, flexible wire, and a flash-lamp bulb. At a slight additional cost a variable resistance may be obtained."

The apparatus is made by Messrs. Allen and Hanburys, Ltd., 48, Wigmore Street, London, W.1.

Magazine for Michel's Clips.

Messrs. Down Bros. have recently made for Mr. BERNARD WARD, F.R.C.S. (Birmingham), a magazine for Michel's clips, which has proved satisfactory in use. It is a combination of Childe's forceps with a fixed magazine. The main advantage claimed for it is that the serrations at the end of Childe's forceps make it easy

to secure eversion of the skin edges and maintain it whilst introducing the clips. The magazine when in use lies parallel with the skin, and the clips are drawn off from the lower end instead of the upper as in Bonney's instrument, a fact which brings the clips closer to the wound and makes for more rapid application. A metal cap fits over the end of the magazine and prevents the clips from slipping off during sterilization or whilst being carried in the surgeon's bag.

The British Medical Association: ITS CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT. AN HISTORICAL SURVEY.

BY

JOHN C. McVAIL, M.D., LL.D., F.R.F.P.S.

(Continued from page 1054.)

III.—THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

THE Annual Congress at Ipswich in 1900 was under the genial presidency of Dr. W. A. Elliston. At the second General Meeting on August 1st, Mr. Victor Horsley brought forward a resolution, of which notice had been given:

"That a Committee be appointed to consider and report upon the best means of reorganizing the constitution of the British Medical Association, such Committee to furnish a provisional report to the Branches by March 1st, 1901." (BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, 1900, vol. ii, pp. 234-321.)

The resolution was carried unanimously, and Mr. Horsley proceeded to submit a list of twenty-three names for membership. This was objected to, and Dr. Ward Cousins moved that half the number be appointed by the Council. After discussion Mr. Horsley accepted the amendment, the number of members being fixed at twenty-four. As regards the attitude which the Committee was to adopt on the crucial question of an annual conference of delegates elected by members from limited areas—a question raised by Dr. Cox—it was agreed by a majority to adopt an amendment by Dr. Radcliffe Crocker:

"That the Committee be invited to consider and report upon the question of delegation in their deliberations, but that they be not instructed that they must evolve such a principle."

At the third General Meeting on the following day (August 2nd) the President of Council intimated the names of the Council's quota of the Committee. They consisted of Surgeon-General Hamilton as representing South Africa, Mr. Cantlie as representing East India and the Archipelago, Sir John Moore as representing Ireland, Dr. J. C. McVail as representing Scotland,* and Mr. Jenner Verrall (Brighton), Dr. S. Woodcock (Manchester), Dr. R. Saundby (Birmingham), Mr. Andrew Clark (London), Dr. Ward Cousins (Portsmouth), Dr. Radcliffe Crocker (London), Mr. H. Butlin (London), and Dr. Roberts Thomson (Bournemouth) as representing England.

Mr. Victor Horsley submitted a list of twelve names to complete the twenty-four: Dr. R. C. Buist of Dundee for Scotland, Professor Byers for Ireland, Dr. C. G. Gooding for the West Indies, Dr. Morier for Australasia, and, for England, Dr. Bateman (London), Dr. Cox (Gateshead), Dr. William Gordon (Exeter), Dr. Milburn (Hull), Dr. A. Brown Ritchie (Manchester), Dr. J. S. Whitaker (Yarmouth), and himself. In regard to Canada he named Professor T. H. Cameron, who was present at the meeting. Professor Cameron, however, suggested Mr. Edmund Owen (London), who would be at Ottawa delivering an address in the following month and would be able to ascertain the local view. This was agreed to and was a most fortunate appointment, as the Committee, being left to elect its own chairman, chose Mr. Owen, who turned out to be a most successful guide and arbiter in very difficult discussions. In addition to the twenty-four members thus appointed the Committee included, *ex officio*, Dr. W. A. Elliston (Ipswich) and Dr. G. B. Ferguson (Cheltenham), respectively the President and President-elect of the Association.

When members of the British Medical Association have occasion to visit its rooms they see on the walls photographs, engravings, or cartoons of many of those who in past years have taken their part in carrying on the great organization which has done so much for the science of

* At that time I was slowly recovering from the effects of a long illness, and though absent from only two meetings I took comparatively little part in the work of the Committee.

medicine and for the interests of the profession since Dr. Charles Hastings called together that memorable gathering at Worcester in 1832. Many of the names are of men who attained a high position in medicine as hospital physicians or surgeons, as teachers, and as scientists who have advanced the knowledge on which the art of medicine is based. In fact there can be comparatively few of the leaders in medicine who have not given time and talent to the Association. Others in their day and generation have done essentially important service in practice in their own localities without attempting to make any extensive contributions to literature or research. Many such men who have a natural capacity for organizing and administrative work have found an outlet for their surplus energies in management of the business of their own profession, to the great benefit of all concerned. Their names also are to be found in what may be called the Association's portrait gallery, but, as generation succeeds generation in the Council and Representative Body and standing committees, individuals are forgotten, and in looking through old numbers of the JOURNAL the names of the forgotten are far more numerous than those of the remembered. The length of time through which a doctor continues to occupy himself in the Association's affairs greatly differs. Some become veterans in the work, others give it up after a few years and are absorbed in practice.

The Constitution Committee of 1901-2 has always seemed to me a very notable body, composed of outstanding men of both the classes just indicated, and a few words, partly from recollection, partly from material freely adopted from the JOURNAL, may be said about those who have already crossed the bourne.

Mr. Edmund Owen, LL.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.S., made a most excellent chairman. He was a handsome man, in his intellectual prime, of impartial judgement and genial temperament, witty and good-humoured. His speech at the General Meeting at Cheltenham, in moving the adoption of the new regulations, was marked by a persuasive eloquence which had a great effect in carrying the resolution. Indeed, had the task been in less skilful hands, the vote might have been lost. Outside of his work for the Association he had a high position. He was surgeon, afterwards consulting surgeon, to St. Mary's Hospital, was twice Vice-President of the Royal College of Surgeons, gave the Lettsomian lectures in 1890, and the Hunterian Oration in 1911. He had a period of presidentship of the Medical Society (London) and also of the Harveian Society. As a surgeon he specialized in operations for deformities, such as cleft palate, hare-lip, and club-foot. He died in 1915.

Dr. W. A. Elliston of Ipswich, the President of the Association, was also a handsome man, and of charming personality. I had the pleasure of being his host at the celebrations of the ninth jubilee of Glasgow University in 1901, and we afterwards enjoyed a brief holiday together in the West Highlands. Dr. Elliston was a delightful companion. He came of a good medical stock and did honour to it. Born in 1840 and educated in the days of medical apprenticeships, he was keenly interested in the science and art of surgery—as is indicated by his spending, whilst a young man, a holiday in attendance at Lister's wards in Glasgow. He was surgeon to the East Suffolk Hospital for thirty years, and took a large part in local affairs as a magistrate and public health reformer. He lectured on sanitation, chemistry, physics, milk, alcohol, and other such topics. Of keen intellect and strict integrity he was quick to condemn but generous to offenders. For the Association's Annual Meeting in Ipswich he was, as a matter of course, selected as President, and his good lady and he made the meeting a great success. To the work of the Constitution Committee he brought all his valuable gifts of character, tact, and breadth of view, and was very helpful in smoothing over difficulties.

Dr. John Ward Cousins of Portsmouth was as long and honourably connected with the work of the Association in his own day as, for example, Dr. J. A. Macdonald of Taunton has been during the past quarter of a century.

Dr. Ward Cousins was President of the Association in 1899, and took a paternal interest in all its affairs. He was practically the founder and builder of the Southern Counties Branch, and had been a successful advocate of the policy of making the Council predominantly a representative body, through election by the Branches. Having achieved this, he regarded representative government as an accomplished fact, the Council being a medical parliament, with the Branches for constituencies. And just as Parliament, once it is elected, does not require to obey from time to time instructions from the constituencies—does not in fact receive such instructions, though representations may be made to it and it will give them respectful attention as well as noting the current of opinion in the country—so the Council was itself to manage the affairs of the Association, according to its own considered judgement. It does not seem to have occurred to Dr. Ward Cousins that the meetings of the Branches, owing to the wide area of country which many of them covered, could not properly represent the views of the practitioners within their bounds; and he can have had no sympathy with the conception of the Council as chiefly an executive for carrying out the decisions of Annual Meetings of delegates from Divisional areas within the Branches. Yet he was, in his own time and way, a real leader of the Association, and it was all to the good that he became a member of the Constitution Committee and fought there for what he considered a sound policy of government. When the Association met in Glasgow in 1888, I spent a day with him in an excursion to the Falls of Clyde. Besides being of strong and vigorous individuality he had cheery social qualities. On being told that an old gentleman in front of the party that day was the Provost of Lanark he hurried forward to be introduced to him, and amusingly remarked to me afterwards on the honour which he felt in having had an interview with so great a dignitary. In his own part of the country Dr. Ward Cousins had a worthily high position as surgeon to the Portsmouth Hospital for nearly half a century—from 1860 to 1908. He died so recently as 1921 at the good old age of 87.

Dr. John Roberts Thomson of Bournemouth was President of the Association at its Annual Meeting there in 1891 and was Chairman of Council 1899-1901. Born near Edinburgh and graduating in that university, he went south and settled in Bournemouth when it was little more than a village, with the nearest railway station several miles away. He became, like Ward Cousins in Portsmouth and Elliston in Ipswich, the leading man in his profession in his part of the country. As a member of the first county council, a magistrate, and chairman of the governors of Bournemouth School, he took a full part in the life of his community and received the freedom of the borough in 1913. He did much good work for the British Medical Association in various capacities. As Chairman of Council he had the duty of stating and supporting the Council's views before the Constitution Committee, but showed no rancour, and accepted adverse decisions as a gentleman should. In the latter part of the Committee's labours he was mainly responsible for the referendum, which did a great deal to reconcile divergent views and allay fears of revolution which after all turned out to be reform. Great credit is due to Dr. Roberts Thomson for the avoidance of a minority report which would almost certainly have prevented the new scheme being carried by the three-fourths majority necessary at the first of the two extraordinary meetings required in such circumstances.

Dr. Robert Saundby, Professor of Medicine in the University of Birmingham, was Chairman of the Association's Council when I became a member of it. He impressed me as a first-rate chairman—competent, clear-headed, forceful, allowing reasonable freedom in discussion, though with a certain temperamental irritability which made it difficult for him to suffer fools gladly. He was an authority on medical ethics and wrote a very good book on that subject. The Constitution Committee appointed him to be deputy chairman, but illness pre-

vented his attendance at the meetings, and we had not the benefit of his sound business acumen. Later on I came into touch with him as a colleague on the General Medical Council, in whose deliberations he took an active and independent part. His health, unfortunately, was not good, and he retired in 1917, dying in the following year when somewhat under 70 years of age.

Sir Victor Horsley, it is no exaggeration to say, was by far the most distinguished, and perhaps also the most influential, member of the Constitution Committee. Indeed, he and Dr. Smith Whitaker can be regarded as having much more responsibility for the fashioning of the new scheme than all the other members jointly. Horsley's world-wide fame as a pioneer in pathology and surgery needs no mention here. It was a feature of his character that he put his whole heart into every project which appealed to him. His zeal as a reformer was unbounded, whether the field for reform was the Royal College of Surgeons, the General Medical Council, the British Medical Association, the registration of nurses, or the suppression of quackery. The very intensity of his convictions led to an intolerance of contradiction, and to a difficulty of believing that those who differed from him could possibly be right or even sincere. For these defects allowance was made where the essential greatness and dynamic force of the man were recognized. But in the Constitution Committee there was little need for any such consideration, and his obvious conviction of the soundness of the principles which he advocated carried great weight. He was the first Chairman of the Representative Body, and for three years he piloted the meetings with great skill through the shoals of a previously uncharted sea of difficulties. His tragic death on war service in Mesopotamia in 1916 was deplored wherever he was known—and he was known throughout the whole world of medicine. Osler said of him: "Better than any man of his generation Victor Horsley upheld a great British tradition, for he combined the experimental physiologist and the practical surgeon in a degree unequalled since John Hunter." There will, however, I think, be general agreement that Osler's generous dictum of "unequalled" should be qualified in respect of the late Sir William Macewen, the distinguished President of the Association in 1922-23, who throughout his life displayed in a remarkable degree the great qualities of John Hunter.

Sir Henry T. Butlin, Bt., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.C.S., was another man who lent weight and distinction to the Constitution Committee. He took a high position as pathologist and microscopist on the staff of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and was a good clinical teacher and operator. He was President of the Royal College of Surgeons in 1909-11, and Hunterian lecturer in 1912, the year before his death. He did much good work for the Association, was Treasurer from 1891 to 1895, and was President at the London meeting in 1910. On the Constitution Committee he was by no means a die-hard, and was especially impressed with the need for freeing the Association from the dangers of the Annual General Meeting.

Dr. H. Radcliffe Crocker, the distinguished dermatologist of University College Hospital, who had been a member of Council and was appointed Treasurer of the Association in 1905, had a place on the Committee, but was not present at many of the meetings and did not take a prominent part in the deliberations.

Mr. Andrew Clark, F.R.C.S., Honorary Surgeon to the King and Surgeon to Middlesex Hospital, was out and out a British Medical Association man. It was, indeed, the main interest of his life, and he devoted himself to its service with single-minded sincerity. At one time he was Chairman of the Council, at another time Treasurer, and he was a member of innumerable committees, so that after the new constitution had fairly established itself he was presented with the Gold Medal of the Association. He was a conscientious, upright, and worthy gentleman. While upholding generally the Council point of view on the Constitution Committee, he was ready to appreciate also what could be urged on the other side. He was one of a small subcommittee to which, at the conclusion of the Committee's

first series of meetings, the drafting of the Provisional Report for submission to the Association was entrusted, though it is right to say that the actual preparation of that important document was mainly in the hands of Dr. Smith Whitaker. Mr. Andrew Clark was the first to have the honour of being appointed to the Council by co-option under the new constitution.

Dr. Samuel Woodcock of Manchester was to me personally the most lovable member of the Committee. I had known him on the Council, to which he had been sent by the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch, after some kind of revolution in its government. I had heard of him as a youth who, before my day, had been a centre of students' activities and socialities in the extramural section of the Glasgow Medical School. He was a man of ready humour and anecdotal celebrity, and a persuasive speaker, lucid and pointed. Withal he was sincerely religious, and in his own district of Manchester he shared in chapel mission work, lay preaching, and Bible teaching. On the school board he paid great attention to sanitation of school buildings. Had he been willing, he might have been in Parliament. For the British Medical Association he did much work, as a member of Council, Chairman of the Parliamentary Bills Committee, and of the Medico-Political Committee. His services were so much valued that the new power of co-option to the Council was exercised on his behalf in 1903, but that, alas! was the year of his death. Until his own generation dies out Sam Woodcock will not be forgotten. On the Constitution Committee he did excellent work in mediating between opposing views.

Dr. George B. Ferguson, F.R.C.S., Surgeon to the Cheltenham Hospital, was President-elect of the Association, and in that capacity was a member of the Constitution Committee. His membership was formal and was not expected to be otherwise, but at the General Meeting at Cheltenham in 1901 his tact and urbanity as chairman did much to get the new constitution through one of the most difficult stages in its career towards adoption. He died with tragic suddenness in 1906.

Dr. A. G. Bateman will be best remembered as General Secretary to the Medical Defence Union. He was an extraordinarily hard worker, a keen judge of character, a safe and sure guide of the Defence Union in its difficult work, had an unsurpassed knowledge of black sheep and quacks, and a capacity for patiently following up offenders and bringing them to justice in the end. On the Constitution Committee he was a very useful member.

Sir John W. Byers, Professor of Midwifery in Queen's University, Belfast, was a representative of Ireland on the Committee. He would certainly have been a good member, but was not present at many of the meetings, no doubt owing to the time and inconvenience involved in the double journey between Belfast and London. Fortunately that difficulty, substantial as it must be, has never deterred the veteran Sir John W. Moore of Dublin from maintaining the close connexion of Irish with British medicine in the Association, and now for many years in the General Medical Council. But he, happily, is still with us, and long may it be before anyone has an opportunity of writing an obituary notice of the genial Sir John.

Surgeon-General John B. Hamilton of the Army Medical Service did good service alike in the army and in the interests of the profession of medicine in its army relationships, as in the matter of the Brodrick report. It is recorded of him that he was of "a brave, resolute, and generous spirit, and one who probably did more than any other to set forth the grievances and plead the cause of his army medical brethren." He did his due share of work on the Constitution Committee.

About the members of the Committee who are still living I must say nothing individually, but from different points of view we all did our best in one direction or another to frame a good constitution; and we have had the pleasure of living to witness the fruits of our labours, as did, indeed, in some degree those who have departed, for notwithstanding early difficulties the constitution has been a success since the beginning.

(To be concluded.)