

whether solicitors or barristers, should be selling themselves as the problem-solvers for parties locked in contentious cases and not simply as the hand-maiden of inexorable judicial processes. They should move themselves to the centre of dispute resolution processes and not be content to remain at the margins. Perhaps we are looking for a new kind of lawyer (and here I make what I think might be an original contribution to the ADR jargon), the “advogiator”.

Well, that brings me to the end of my attempt at a narrative account of my lecture at the BILA Annual Conference held in September 1989. I hope it is a reasonably coherent account. Needless to say, if any BILA member would like clarification or further and better particulars I would do my best to help (write to me at the Faculty of Law, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT).

**MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
held at University College, London, WC1
at 12:00 noon on Tuesday, September 19, 1989**

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Messrs. Lincoln, Lock and Pincott.

MINUTES OF THE LAST ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on Tuesday, September 20, 1988, and printed in Journal No. 69 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

MATTERS ARISING

None.

ELECTION OF AUDITORS

The meeting unanimously agreed that the auditors, Charles Rippin & Turner should be re-elected for the coming year.

REPORTS

The Hon. Secretary’s report for the year ending September 1989 was presented and agreed.

The report of the Hon. Treasurer was presented to the meeting and a number of comments and observations were made by members. Professor Cockerell felt it wrong that a report so heavily qualified by the auditors should only have been available at the meeting: such a report should have been drawn to the attention of members well before the AGM. Further observations from the floor expressed considerable disquiet about the level of outstanding subscriptions and asked for explanations and assurances that the problem would be resolved. In the absence of the Hon. Treasurer, the Chairman and the Secretary explained the steps which would immediately be taken to relieve the problem. These included the automation of the subscription list, regular follow-up on outstanding subscriptions, and the introduction of direct debits.

The Hon. Treasurer's report was, with these reservations, adopted by the meeting after being proposed by Ken Davidson and seconded by Jonathan Foster.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Details were given of the AIDA Congress to be held in Copenhagen in 1990 and members were asked to notify their interest in attending as soon as possible.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The following Officers were elected:

President	:	Professor A.L Diamond
Deputy President	:	(See note below)
Vice Presidents	:	Professor H.A.L. Cockerell, OBE Mr. M.A. Cohen Mr. G.W. Shaw
Chairman	:	Mr. G. Cornish
Vice Chairman	:	Mr. K.M. Davidson
Immediate Past Chairman	:	Mr. J.A. Pincott
Hon. Secretary	:	Mr. R. Hanson-James
Hon. Sci. Secretary	:	Mr. J. Foster
Hon. Treasurer	:	Mr. M. England

The Chairman pointed out that the position of Deputy President was still vacant but said that the Committee were actively looking for a suitably qualified and interested member of the insurance community.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEE

There were six duly recorded nominations for six vacancies and the following were elected:

Mr. S. Bailey
Mr. R. Brown
Mr. D. Cole
Mr. R. Doulton
Miss A. Green
Mr. M. Lock

CLOSING REMARKS

The Chairman expressed his particular thanks to retiring members of the Committee, Bryan Lincoln and Frances Paterson, and also to Maurice England, for their considerable help during the year.

The meeting closed at 12:30 hours.

Note by Chairman: Since the date of the AGM Mr. J.S. Butler has accepted the Committee's invitation to become Deputy President.

LUNCHTIME ADDRESS **by Mark Gore, FIMBRA**

This paper is concerned with the aftermath of Big Bang and one of the black holes which has appeared in the galaxy of financial regulation, namely Section 62 of the Financial Services Act 1986. The Act is a gallant attempt to combine government agency control and so called self regulation. Although its general ambit and significance are fully appreciated in professional circles, there is merit in focussing attention upon the specific civil right of action afforded by the Act.

Section 62 makes a contravention of the relevant rules of an S.R.O. actionable at the suit of a person who suffers loss as a result of the contravention subject to the defences and other incidents applying to actions for breach of statutory duty. It was inserted in response to the 1985 White Paper which put forward the principle that investors should have a statutory right to recover damages for loss from authorised firms in respect of breaches of certain rules. The section's operation was deferred to October 1988 because the S.R.O.s and particularly T.S.A., were obsessively apprehensive