

malady and treated as such. Dr. G. F. Boddington read a paper "On the control and restraint of habitual drunkards." He considered that the general opinion among medical men was that a remedy was requisite for this crying evil, which medical men could not only fully appreciate, but which they were powerless to remove. Could the public fully recognize the degradation and misery resulting from drunkenness, indignation would at once mount up, and medical men would be saved any further trouble by the country insisting on remedial measures. Professor Christison said that there was no doubt a well-considered resolution on the subject treated of in the last two papers, put forth under the auspices of the Association, ought to have great weight with the Government. They must therefore be careful what they said. He proposed a resolution, which was as follows:—"That excessive intemperance is in many cases a symptom of a special form of insanity which requires special treatment, with a view, first, to the recovery of those affected, and secondly, to the protection and advantage of them and of society; that in the present state of the law such treatment is not attainable; and that it is desirable that legal provision be made to render it attainable." Dr. Husband, of York, seconded the motion. Dr. Morris, Baltimore, stated that though he lived in a country where personal liberty was greatly prized, yet there was a law in some parts by which they could confine confirmed drunkards. Dr. Playfair said that he had been on the Committee on Habitual Drunkards, and although at first of opinion that education alone could prevent drunkenness, the evidence adduced before the Committee led him to sign the Report recommending restraint for habitual drunkards. The motion was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously. Dr. J. Rogers read a paper "On the anomalies and deficiencies of parochial medical relief in Scotland," and urged the claim of that country to be put on an equal footing with England and Ireland. Dr. Mitchell and Mr. A. Buchan presented a paper "On the relation between weather and mortality in London, and the influence of the weather on the death-rate from different diseases and at different ages in London and other large towns." Inspector-General Smart presented a paper "On the rate of deaths by violence in the Navy, the Army, and in civil life." Several other papers were read.

In Section E, Dr. John Sibbald read a paper "On the relative amount of pauper lunacy in town and country," on which he submitted the conclusion that there was no proof that insanity was increasing, and that especially suicide, the unmistakable mark of mental overthrow, showed no evidence of increase.

In the Physiological Section, the most interesting paper was that "On physiological acoustics, with experimental illustrations," by Dr. M'Kendrie, Edinburgh.

In the evening a public dinner of the association was held in the Music-hall, covers being laid for about 500. The chair was taken by Sir Robert Christison.

The concluding sittings of the Association were held on Friday. Professor Rutherford delivered the address of the Physiological Section in the lecture-room of the Museum of Science and Art. He said that in the Medical School of Scotland physiology was still designated "the Institutes of Medicine." This somewhat ancient title had the advantage of continually keeping before the minds of the students the fact that physiology lay at the foundation of scientific medicine. Much had indeed been done in Germany and elsewhere to detach physiology from medicine and to devolve it as a branch of purely natural science. Such a development, however, gave to physiology an aspect somewhat different than that which it wore when they regarded it as "the Institutes of Medicine," and therefore this title was useful to the teacher, inasmuch as it constantly reminded him that he was more especially to dwell on those facts of physiology which were of value to the practitioner of medicine. At the present time there was reason for some anxiety with regard to the manner in which "the Institutes of Medicine" were to be studied by students. In recent years the teaching of physiology had made a great stride in this country. Laboratories had been organized, and physiological instruction had in most institutes passed to an experimental position of the subject. He supposed that many of those whom he addressed had an experience of physiological tuition similar to his own. At this moment there was a danger of a return to something like that miserable mode of instruction in consequence of the fanatical clamour of a number of persons, excited, it must be admitted, by one or two members of their own profession. He could not suppose that any member of that Association entertained the idea that experiments on the lower animals were not justifiable for the discovery of new truth, but he was aware that there were some who entertained the idea that vivisection was not necessary where it had for its object the mere demonstration for educational purposes of facts already known. Those who held this doctrine appeared to him to forget that physiology was an experimental science, and that no right conception of the subject could be obtained unless the student was shown the experiments that were necessary for the demonstration of certain facts. (Applause, and a Voice—"No, no.") The student was apt to forget that which he was merely told, but the impression of that which he had seen was with difficulty effaced. He maintained that this definite and critical knowledge regarding the bodily organism could not be attained unless the students were shown experiments on living animals. It was too much to assume that those who advocated a superficial