

to legislation on the subject of the practice of medicine; I believe that many evils may be corrected, but that you would have very much the same results if there were no legislation whatever.

2399. I must again refer you to your answer respecting the effect of this Bill, which you say has a tendency to create a single faculty; you apprehend, as I judge, from what you have stated, that it would lower the status of the profession, and that it would have the effect of lowering medical education to the qualification of the general practitioner?—Yes.

2400. But does not the experience which you have had in your own College, where there is one standard of education adopted for members, and another standard of education adopted for fellows, convince you that some practitioners of ambitious minds and considerable acquirements would not be content with the lowest position in the profession?—Certainly.

2401. If the Bill which has been introduced into Parliament in the present session were to be enacted into a law, do you consider that the present arrangements of the College of Surgeons would be disturbed by its operation; and if so, will you explain in what manner?—I conceive that their arrangements would not be disturbed except it were thought necessary to send the inspector to us. I do not know of any other interference that there would be with our arrangements.

2402. You would still examine for members, and still examine for fellows, and the two parties would hold their respective ranks?—Yes.

2403. Whatever emulation now exists with reference to obtaining a higher position would not be disturbed or lessened in any degree by the operation of this Bill?—That I do not know. I should say that the tendency of this Bill is to destroy the desire to become members, still more to become fellows; but it would not prevent persons if they chose to come, and if they thought it an advantage they would come; they are not forced to come now.

2404. It is voluntary at the present time?—Yes.

2405. But they apply for the diploma of the College in consequence of the high distinction which it confers upon them?—Yes.

2406. Should you think, from anything which you have read in that Bill, that that inducement would be in the slightest degree lessened or weakened?—Yes, I should think it would.

2407. Will you be kind enough to explain in what manner? I conceive that no one would seek a distinction which is expensive or troublesome, when he can obtain the same advantages without it. Now, the principle of this Bill is to effect a registration, and a party can be put upon that register without any such means of distinction, and he gets that distinction which his diploma would otherwise give him in a cheaper and easier way; another thing is, that by the law at present certain persons are obliged to come to the College, who mean to be surgeons of unions or of prisons, but the Bill repeals all previous Acts of Parliament.

2408. The registered practitioner is qualified, under this Bill, to practise in any department of his profession; do you object to that arrangement?—I do; and my objection lies not in the registry, but in the want of any provision for insuring an adequate qualification in those licensed to practise. I approve entirely of the principle of registration, as being most beneficial to the public.

Thursday, July 15th, 1847.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Acland.	Sir R. H. Inglis.	Mr. Wakley.
Mr. Aldam.	Mr. Hamilton.	Colonel Thomas
Mr. Bannerman.	Right Hon. T. B.	Wood.
Sir James Graham.	Macaulay.	

THE RIGHT HON. T. B. MACAULAY IN THE CHAIR.

Joseph Henry Green, Esq., F.R.S., called in, and further examined.

1415. Mr. Wakley.]—When you were examined on a former occasion, you stated in reply to the last question which was put to you, that you had read over the Bills which had been introduced into Parliament at the time when they were introduced, but that not knowing that you would be examined on the subjects of them, you had not read them lately; have you read them since you were examined?—I have.

2416. Have you referred particularly to the Bill of July, 1845?—Yes.

2418. Refer, if you please, to clauses two and three, page three. Do you find in those clauses that a Council of Health was to be constituted, consisting of thirteen persons?—Yes.

2419. One of them being one of the principal Secretaries of

State, and twelve to be appointed by her Majesty, with the advice of her Privy Council?—Yes.

2420. Do you remember whether the Bill containing that proposal was before the Council of the College of Surgeons?—Yes, I do.

2421. Was it approved by the College?—Not altogether. Those clauses were approved of, to the best of my recollection.

2422. Do you recollect whether there was any discussion on the proposition for giving to the Crown the entire appointment of the Council of Health, there being no person in that Council chosen by any of the Colleges?—Previously there had been much discussion. In the previous Bill, or in the one before it, the constitution of the Council of Health had been different.

2423. There were *ex-officio* members from different universities and colleges?—Yes.

2424. And that arrangement in the last Bill was altered?—It was.

2425. Do you recollect whether the change met with the approval or the dissent of the Council of the College of Surgeons?—To the best of my recollection it was entirely approved of.

2426. Leaving the appointment entirely with the Crown?—Yes.

2427. And there being no provision whatever in those clauses for there being an *ex-officio* member from any medical body, or any elected member from any medical body, but the whole being entirely with the Crown?—Yes.

2428. Was there any discussion with regard to the safety of leaving the College, as it were, under a lay government, as provided in those two clauses?—Previously there had been discussions upon the subject, but I do not recollect when this Bill was read before the Council, and gone over clause by clause, that any discussion arose upon the subject at that time.

2429. But in the Bill which was introduced into Parliament in the last Session, the supervision of the Colleges with regard to the curricula was to be confided to the Queen in Council, and you objected to that arrangement?—Yes.

2430. Do you now see that there is some incongruity in your answers to the questions on those points?—Certainly, an apparent incongruity, but the principle seems to be different. In the first place,—that is to say, in the Bill of July, 1845,—persons were appointed who would be known to the country, and for the appointment of whom the Secretary of State would be at once responsible in his place in the House of Commons; whereas, under the provisions of the last Medical Registration Bill nobody would know who was to be sent as an inspector. The Secretary of State might send his family medical attendant, or somebody who was not at all known or responsible, and might immediately, from the account and report of an unknown person, adopt measures which would be perhaps very disagreeable to the Council, and, perhaps, not very just.

2431. But supposing the Secretary of State, under the operation of the Bill of 1845, were to receive reports from his inspectors, he would then refer those reports entirely to a Board of his own choosing, and there is no provision in the Bill, is there, for any portion of that Board consisting of medical men?—No, there is no provision, certainly, for the appointment of any medical men, but at the same time one cannot suppose that where the names of the persons are known to the whole country, the Secretary of State could appoint persons who were unfit for the trust.

2432. Would you have any security for knowing the names until they were appointed?—No; but being appointed, they would be known, and, therefore, any objections to them might be stated as to their unfitness.

2433. What you fear then is, if I correctly understand your meaning, that under the operation of the last Bill which was introduced into the House, the Secretary of State, on receiving the reports of the visitors, might be influenced by private advice insidiously, and sometimes with a sinister object?—Yes.

2434. And that you would have no security that the advice received by the Secretary of State, he not being himself acquainted with medical subjects, would refer to persons of competent authority and judgment on such occasions?—Yes.

2435. Then you prefer for such arrangements the constitution of a Council of Health?—Yes.

2436. But do not you think it advisable that security should be taken in any measure that might be introduced into Parliament for providing that that Council of Health should consist of competent medical men?—Yes, I think it would be very desirable, but the difficulty is to know how to appoint by any other mode than by nomination by the Secretary of State, or by the Crown, persons who would be fit, without involving great difficulties, as was seen in the appointment of *ex officio* members.

2437. Would you not rather that they should be elected by the different medical authorities of the Universities and the Colleges?—That was considered, but there is very great difficulty in the way of it, as I think you will see when you come to consider it. In London you have a College of Physicians and a College of Surgeons. Then there was proposed by the Bill, what I did not at all approve of, a College of General Practitioners. Then there are the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the Colleges in Edinburgh, and the Colleges in Dublin, which already make up a very considerable number, without mentioning other parties, who would claim a share in the election.

2438. Your objection, probably, was chiefly directed against the *ex officio* members, because, probably, you will admit that a man might be a very good regius professor of medicine, but he might be very incompetent to act in the Council of Health as one of a government for medical education?—Certainly; but there are difficulties likewise with respect to the election of others.

2439. But supposing a law were to be enacted, empowering the different Colleges and Universities to select a person whom they deemed to be competent to represent them in such a council, you, not looking to other institutions, surely could satisfactorily conduct such an election or choice in your own institution?—Yes, it is very true; but I am afraid, in order to satisfy all parties, you would have a very unwieldy Board. My answer would depend very much upon the number that you propose for the constitution of the Council of Health.

2443. Do you consider that there should be very striking distinctions in the mode of educating medical practitioners?—No, not very striking distinctions.

2444. In all the elementary branches you would make no distinction?—No.

2446. You think that, having secured to the public a competent number of qualified men, other inducements should be offered to push the mental acquirements of a certain class to the highest possible point?—Yes.

2447. But are you aware that the education of the general practitioner is more costly than the education of the last physicians?—No, I was not aware of that.

2448. Have you ever estimated the expense?—No.

2449. Have you never felt it to be your duty in framing your own curricula, to refer to what the expenditure might be for the great body of the members of the College?—It is not a subject to which I have turned my attention; but I apprehend that it would be found that the chief expense of medical education is in the time that it occupies, not in the expense for the actual teaching. I suppose that the whole of the education of a general practitioner in respect to the payment of fees for lectures and attendance at the hospitals would not amount to 100%.

2450. You are aware that your own regulations require now a three years' residence in London?—Yes.

2451. You are also aware that the Apprenticeship Clause of the Apothecaries' Act requires that a period of five years should be passed as an apprentice?—Yes.

2452. And that in order to be bound an apprentice, the individual often pays a very high premium?—Yes.

2453. And thus that, according to the Act of Parliament and to the regulations which are founded upon that Act, at least eight years are expended by the general practitioner before he can pass the Apothecaries' Hall?—Yes.

2454. And then he also has to comply with your regulations with reference to becoming a member of the College of Surgeons,—that is, if he is to hold the joint qualification?—Yes.

2455. Are you aware of any expenditure equal to what must be incurred by the occupation of such a period of time in medical study which is incurred by the mass of physicians who are graduates of medicine in Universities generally?—No, I have not entered into any calculation of that kind, therefore my evidence would be, I apprehend, of very little value upon the point.

2456. When you stated, in a previous answer, that the arrangements must be regulated by the needs of the practitioners and the wants of society, you were chiefly pointing, I presume, to the pecuniary means of persons who were engaged in medical studies?—Yes.

2457. Your mind now having been directed to that subject, do you consider that the expenditure incurred by the great body of the graduates of medicine exceeds that which is incurred by the great body of those who become general practitioners?—I really have not given my mind to the point so as to be able to give you a clear answer to that question, but certainly you have surprised me by what you have stated.

2471. Do you consider that your charter empowers you to

require attendance on the practice of medicine, and upon pharmacy, and upon midwifery?—I have not read it with that view, but I presume so.

2472. Then if you have the power to require certificates of attendance on such subjects, have you not also the power to examine on such subjects?—Yes, I suppose so.

2473. Do you consider that there would be any valid objection to your instituting such examinations?—No, except that it would be making it an examination for general practitioners instead of for surgeons.

2474. You say you object to the formation of a college of general practitioners?—Yes.

2475. And if you have the power to examine on all those subjects and require attendance on them, whence the objection to your actually instituting such examinations?—The objection to my mind consists in the great importance that there is in the prosecution of surgery as a science, and that if you combine it with examinations and with other means of including the general practitioners as such in that institution, making it in fact a college in some way of general practitioners, you will in proportion deteriorate the institution as one for the promotion of scientific surgery.

2476. But is it not now a college of general practitioners?—No, of surgeons.

2477. Have you not more than 12,000 members in your College who are practising generally?—Certainly; but they are only members of our College in as far as they are surgeons.

2478. You say "only members." Inasmuch as they have challenged examination before you, if they are incompetent, whose fault is it? If they are not scientific men; if they are men not competent as surgeons, with whom lies the fault?—With us, if they are not.

2479. It is to be hoped that they are not, and I believe that they are not; but do you consider that it would detract from the reputation of such men if it were known that they had been examined before you on other subjects than that of surgery?—No.

2840. Inasmuch as by such an examination they might exhibit extensive knowledge, and by your examination and your regulations you might compel them to do so, would it not rather enhance their reputation than otherwise?—No, I do not know that it would. It is most essential, I conceive, that the character of the College of Surgeons should be kept as strictly as possible an institution for the promotion of surgery.

2481. Then why do you require attendance upon the practice of medicine, chemistry, and the other subjects which you have named?—Because we think that it is very proper that they should be acquainted with those as subsidiary branches of surgical science.

2482. Would not the propriety be more strongly exhibited if you were to carry it to a still greater extent, and at once examine the candidates on those subjects, and prove their competency?—That is very true, and I should see no objection to appointing examiners for that purpose; but we had it fully before our eyes that those wants were already provided for, and we should as little think of examining them upon those subjects as we should upon theology, though we should think it very desirable that they should be acquainted with that subject too.

2483. Then the reason of your not examining them has been, that you think that that work has been performed elsewhere?—Yes.

2484. Then if that be the case, why do you require attendance upon the subjects which you have named, but on which subjects you do not examine?—To show that we do not admit persons without the knowledge in question. You will recollect, too, that there may be persons who come up for a surgeon's diploma who are not intended for general practice.

2485. Then supposing that a person brings his licence from the Apothecaries' Hall, and proves that he has undergone an examination there, would you still require that he should produce certificates of attendance on the lectures which you have named?—It would be according to our regulations; but certainly I very readily admit that it would be then unnecessary, in consequence of the examination of the Society of Apothecaries.

2486. When you say that you wish, in a great measure, to confine the College of Surgeons to the promotion of surgery as a science, do you admit that your members are not a body of scientific men?—No, I consider them scientific men.

2487. And you consider that they are qualified to practise as surgeons?—Certainly.

2488. In your mind the capacity for so doing is not withdrawn by the simple circumstance of a man's proving that he is competent to do something more?—No.

2489. You are aware that the duties which often devolve upon the general practitioner occupy a very wide range, and extend, in fact, over the whole field of medical and surgical practice; is not that so?—Yes, but I presume that if you wanted an operation performed, you would be more likely to select a hospital surgeon than you would a general practitioner or an apothecary from a village.

2490. Without doubt, I should refer to one who had been accustomed to operate, but considering that the practitioners living in remote districts are entirely relying upon their own resources, do not you think that it is of the utmost importance to the public, that they should, as far as you can possibly make them so, be rendered competent, not only for what are called the ordinary exigencies of the profession, but also any accidents or emergencies which might arise?—Yes, I would very gladly see a Sir Benjamin Brodie in every village in England.

2491. You are quite aware that whatever the education may be, if you start upon a perfect equality with regard to their examination or education, some, in consequence of greater energy, greater industry, and greater ability, will necessarily take the first place?—Yes.

2492. Still you do think it desirable that, in the minimum qualification, security should be had that the public are protected in having a competent body of medical practitioners?—Yes; and I will add to that, that I think it would be very desirable that every one entering the profession should have a qualification in all the branches; that that should be provided for; *I think the State has a right to require that, that for every one entering the profession, there should be, as it has been called, one portal.* That, I apprehend, will relieve you of some trouble in examining me.

2493. Sir R. H. Inglis.]—*You say that you think it desirable that there should be one portal, by which all parties might enter the profession of medicine; will you explain to the Committee what you understand, and desire them to understand, by the term, "one portal"?*—*That all, on entering the profession, should be subjected to one and the same examination on anatomy, medicine, surgery, midwifery, and pharmacy.*

2494. You have stated that it is your wish that there should be a Sir Benjamin Brodie in every village in the country; do you conceive it to be possible that the course of education and the experience which have enabled Sir Benjamin Brodie to be what he is, could be realized in the case of each of the 13,000 or 14,000 gentlemen who compose at this moment the body of your own College, or of an equal number, who are licensed under the Apothecaries' Act?—No, quite impossible.

2495. If it then be impossible that you should produce in every village in the country such an experienced practitioner as Sir Benjamin Brodie, does it not follow, as a matter of course, that a large number, an enormous proportion, of those who practise medicine in its different branches, must cease their course of education at a lower point than that at which Sir Benjamin Brodie ceased his course of education?—Yes.

2496. How, then, do you recommend this Committee to entertain the proposition that there should be one system of education which is to be carried out, and how do you reconcile the practical conclusion to which you come with your requirement that there should be one system of education, seeing that, by your own statement, you hardly expect that more than one in 13,000 should become a Sir Benjamin Brodie?—I think I have been misunderstood if that inference has been drawn from what I have said, because the whole tenour of my examination has been favourable to the establishment of distinctions in the profession, and though I would let them go in at one gate, yet at the same time, having entered, they must take different directions, and some proceed much farther than others. My object in using the term "one portal" was, because it has been made a sort of technical term. It has been objected to, I know, by some who have given their opinions upon this subject, but I think that those who have objected to it have not considered that by adopting one initial examination for all, it would remove very much the invidious character of those distinctions, which the opposite party repudiate. Clearly we must be all of one profession, if we have begun alike: but at the same time I think it essential to the welfare of the profession, that motives should be held out for higher attainments, and that those who aim at higher distinctions should undergo other examinations which should give assurance of their competency, and of their having proceeded further in their studies.

2497. Then in point of fact you would wish the Committee to understand, that while on the one hand you would desire that there should be one general and preliminary examination for all the members of your common profession, there should be a subsequent examination of the class of medical practi-

tioners called physicians, another for the class called surgeons, and possibly another for the class called apothecaries or general practitioners?—I should see no reason for the last; that I think would be included in the first examination.

2498. Then you would think it sufficient to subject the general practitioner to the trial of the first examination?—Yes.

2499. But you require a second examination for the class of practitioners to be called physicians, and another distinct examination for those who are to be called surgeons?—Yes.

2511. Is not the great objection to the apprenticeship system rested upon the length of time—namely, five years, absorbed from the general education of the young man?—Yes.

2512. But, in point of fact, are the five years usually so absorbed from his general education. Is it, or is it not, the fact in St. Thomas's Hospital, with which you have been so long and honourably connected, that the young men who attend your lectures and the courses of lectures in that hospital, are in the large majority of cases young men who are nominally apprentices?—I believe it is so.

2514. In your answer to question 2353 you assume that the apprenticeship is not nominal, but you take a young man who has come from an apprenticeship of five years, and you compare him with one who has been at the University?—Yes.

2515. And you compare their respective qualifications and preferences. Will you be pleased to state whether the education of the young man at the University does not necessarily involve an expenditure of at least double that which the apprenticeship system would involve in the case of the other young man, and whether, therefore, you could expect that an equal number of young men should go to the University, as go through the apprenticeship system, considering merely the relative expenses of the two?—Certainly not; it cannot be expected.

2516. Mr. Wakley.]—Do you mean that apprentices cannot be procured by surgeons or by general practitioners?—I believe by both.

2518. But are you not aware that it is peremptory with regard to the Act of 1815, and that the young man cannot legally undergo his examination at the Apothecaries' Hall unless he has passed an apprenticeship of five years?—Yes; but I am led to understand that the apprenticeship is in many instances a nominal business.

2519. Have you reason for believing that the Society of Apothecaries have evaded the law?—No, I really know so little about it that I would not undertake to say that. I am very willing that it should be put down as my impression that an apprenticeship is little more than nominal; but what the Society of Apothecaries have done I must leave them to explain.

2520. Mr. Acland.]—Supposing it to be true that very eminent men have by their own great powers risen to the top of their profession, who yet commenced it by apprenticeship, does that in the slightest degree alter your opinion as to the waste of time which is now caused by the apprenticeship system?—We are talking of different things, I apprehend. With respect to an apprentice to a surgeon of a hospital, or to a hospital, for they are registered in our hospital, and are recognised really as belonging to the hospital, though apprenticed to a particular surgeon; a young man of that kind has every opportunity, if he have diligence, of studying his profession from the beginning of his apprenticeship to the end.

2521. Mr. Wakley.]—Of studying pharmacy?—He has the opportunity.

2522. He has the run of the dispensary, has he not?—He must pay for it.

2523. Mr. Acland.]—Supposing that a few very great men by their own powers may have risen to the top of their profession, even if they were apprentices to apothecaries, would that shake your conviction that an early education is what the mass of the general practitioners now requires?—No; but I do not wish to mislead the Committee by giving such very short answers. The defect in the apprenticeship, as I have had occasion to observe, of the general practitioners is, that they have left school very early, at fourteen or fifteen it may be; that they have spent the next five or six years (I forget now exactly the time) with a country apothecary or general practitioner, and that as far as I have had occasion to make out, that period which they have spent with the general practitioner has been in very many instances without profit; that they have had no opportunity of continuing their studies, which have been very short, at school, and that they have learned nothing fresh.

(To be continued.)