2. To examine the state of the children on their admission into the school, and make a record of the same, and to give the requisite directions to the superintendent for their classification and treatment.
3. To give directions from time to time as to the diet, classification, and treatment of the sick children, and to make suggestions with reference to the children in general.
4. To vaccinate such of the children as may require vaccination.
5. To report in writing to the managers any defect in the diet, drainage, ventilation, warmth, or other arrangements of the school, or any excess in the number of the inmates, whether in the school generally, or in any particular ward, which he may deem to be detrimental to the health of the inmates.
6. To report in writing to the managers any defects which he may observe in the arrangements of the Infirmary, and in the performance of their duties by the nurses of the sick.
7. To make a return to the managers, at each ordinary meeting, in a book prepared according to the Form (B.) and to insert therein the particulars required by such form to be inserted by the Medical Officer, and to enter in such return the death of every child who shall die in the school, together with the apparent cause thereof.
8. To enter in the commencement of such book, according to the Form marked (C.) the proper dietary for the sick in the school in so many different scales as he shall deem expedient.
9. To give to the managers, when required, any reasonable information respecting the case of any pauper who is or has been under his care; to make any such written report relative to any sickness prevalent among the children under his care, as the Managers or Commissioners may require of him; and to attend any meeting of the District Board when requested by them to do so.
10. To give a certificate respecting children whom it is proposed to apprentice.
11. In keeping the book prescribed by this Order, to employ, so far as is practicable, the terms used or recommended in the regulations and statistical nosology issued by the Registrar-General, and also to show when the visit or attendance made or given was made or given by any person employed by himself.

EXPLANATION OF TERMS.

Art. 225. Whenever the word "Overseer" is used in this Order, it shall be taken to include any person acting, or legally bound to act in the discharge of any of the duties usually performed by Overseers of the Poor, so far as such duties are referred to in this Order.

Art. 226. Whenever the word "Commissioners" is used in this Order, it shall be taken to mean the Poor Law Commissioners.

Art. 227. Whenever the word "medicines" is used in this order, it shall be taken to include all medical and surgical appliances; whenever the words "medical attendance" are used in this Order, they shall be taken to include surgical attendance; and whenever the words "medical relief" are used in this Order, they shall be taken to include relief by surgical as well as medical attendance.

Art. 228. Whenever the words "Medical Officer" are used in this Order, they shall be taken to include any person duly licensed as a medical man, who may have contracted or agreed with any Guardians for the supply of medicines, or for medical attendance.

Art. 232. Whenever in describing any person or party, matter or thing, the word importing the singular number or the masculine gender only is used in this Order, the same shall be taken to include, and shall be applied to, several persons or parties as well as one person or party, and females as well as males, and several matters or things as well as one matter or thing, respectively, unless there be something in the subject or context repugnant to such construction.

Art. 233. Whenever in this Order any Article is referred to by its number, the Article of this Order bearing that number shall be taken to be signified thereby.

EXTRACTS FROM THE OFFICIAL CIRCULARS OF THE POOR LAW BOARD.

MEDICAL RELIEF TO POOR PERSONS.

MEDICAL RELIEF TO A PERSON NOT IN THE RECEIPT OF OTHER RELIEF.

1. The Commissioners think the Medical Officer is bound to attend upon any person whom the Guardians, or other authority competent to give relief, may deem to want and be properly entitled to receive relief at the cost of the Union. The Commissioners do not understand this power to order medical relief to be limited to parties already in the receipt of other relief.

It is immaterial as regards constituting a person a pauper what may be the description of relief which may be ordered him, whether it be food or money or medicine, if it be furnished at the cost of the poor rates. It is the application of the person to be relieved, coupled with the fact of relief being granted, which renders a person a pauper.

The obligation upon those who have the administration of relief to supply necessary medical assistance to a person labouring under dangerous illness, though such person may not have received, or stood in need of relief previous to his illness, is established by the decision in R. *v.* Warren, Russ. and R., Cr. cases 48.

The Commissioners need not say that care should be taken not to inflict an injury on the medical men by improper orders, in addition to the injustice of causing such attendance to be paid for from the poor rates. *August* 9, 1842.

MEDICAL RELIEF TO AN ABLE-BODIED PERSON, EARNING FROM 9s. TO 12s. PER WEEK, HAVING WIFE OR CHILD ILL; OR ABLE-BODIED PERSON WHO IS A MEMBER OF A SICK CLUB, AND ENTITLED TO RECEIVE 10s. A WEEK, AS BED PAY, IS ENTITLED TO MEDICAL RELIEF.

2. The Commissioners can only point out that if a person is able to provide himself and family with food, lodging, and clothing, while they are in health, *but is unable in case of sickness to provide medical aid, is entitled to receive medical relief at the charge of the poor rates.* Although he does not apply for any other sort of relief, he has not the less claim to that kind of relief which he actually stands in need of. *May*, 1845.

MEDICAL RELIEF DURING CHILDBIRTH TO WIVES OF ABLE-BODIED PERSONS.

3. The Commissioners are of opinion it is impossible to regulate this matter by general rule. The Guardians and Relieving Officers must exercise their discretion in individual cases. The urgency of the case may outweigh all considerations of how many children the man has. The difficulty of such cases is inherent in all detailed administrations of a poor law, whatever may be the system persued, or the constitution of the authorities to whom the discretion to give the order is entrusted. *Dec.* 21, 1844.

MEDICAL RELIEF.—CONSTRUCTION OF ARTICLES 16 AND 17 OF THE GENERAL MEDICAL RELIEF ORDER.

4. The Commissioners took into consideration a letter addressed to them by the Clerk of the Chipping Norton Union, inquiring whether it is intended by these articles, that separate tickets should be made out for the wives of aged and infirm persons, and persons permanently sick or disabled, or whether the ticket of the husband will be sufficient to authorize attendance on the wife—the wife not being a "person actually receiving relief"—when the Commissioners directed the following answer to be given thereto:—

"The Commissioners wish to observe that it does not follow that because all relief to a wife or child is chargeable to the husband, the wife or child, therefore, is not also receiving relief. The former is often chargeable only constructively; the words 'actually receiving relief,' were used in the Order, in opposition to any such constructive chargeability.

"The Commissioners consider that the parties actually sick or infirm, and actually relieved, should be placed on the list required by the Order. *April* 26, 1842.

ONE APPLICATION OF THE TERM "ABLE-BODIED."

5. Poor persons who have frequent ailments, who are ruptured, and are generally of weak constitutions, while they may be in the receipt of full wages, must be dealt with as able-bodied persons, as relief is not given by the statute of Eliz. to such as have an ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by. *April*, 1848.

MEDICAL RELIEF TO PERSONS POSSESSED OF SMALL PROPERTIES.

TO A PERSON POSSESSED OF A COW AND HEIFER.

6. The Commissioners are of opinion that, as a general principle, persons possessed of property cannot be considered as proper objects for relief, not being in that destitute condition which constitutes the title to relief; cases may, however, occur in which persons may have an interest in property, and yet, being incapable of labour, may be without the means necessary for their support. In such cases it is for the Board of Guardians to exercise their discretion as to giving relief. The question is, whether the property possessed by a person in such case is available for the supply of the wants which such person applies to the Guardians to relieve; and of this the Guardians must judge according to the circumstances of the case. They, however, cannot compel the pauper to sell the cow and heifer, although they might refuse to afford relief. But, in a case where the person is notoriously without the means of maintaining himself or herself, and is unwilling to dispose of the property, the Commissioners think that the Guardians might incur a serious responsibility by refusing relief, supposing the necessities of such person to be urgent, until the property were disposed of. *August*, 1845.

TO A PERSON POSSESSED OF PROPERTY.

7. As regards the question, whether the Guardians should refuse relief to the pauper alluded to by you, until he has disposed of his freehold property, I am to state that, as a general rule, persons possessed of property cannot be considered as coming within the class of destitute persons, for whose benefit and relief the poor rate is provided. In some cases, however, it may be that the possession of property, from the incumbrances or charges to which it may be subject, is an actual disadvantage to the owner; in others, that the benefit derived is very inconsiderable. In those cases where owners of property may apply for relief, having no means of support derived from other sources, the Commissioners are not prepared to advise the Guardians to refuse relief to such persons, except upon the condition that they should dispose of their interest in the property.

In some instances it might be proper to require this. The difficulty of discriminating between cases in which it might be proper to grant, and those in which it would be right to withold relief, is, no doubt, considerable. The Commissioners would only observe, that it appears to them that relief in the Workhouse would be the least objectionable mode in which relief could be granted in doubtful cases of this description, as it affords the surest guarantee that the persons receiving the relief are in the condition which alone constitutes a title to relief. *March* 4, 1843.

RELIEF TO PERSONS POSSESSED OF FREEHOLD COTTAGES.

8. It rests with the Guardians of the Union to determine whether the parties in possession of the freehold cottages are proper objects for relief. Certainly, as a general rule, persons possessed of property cannot be cosidered as coming within the class of destitute persons, for whose benefit the poor rate is provided. In some cases, however, it may be that such property, from the incumbrances and charges to which it may be subject, is an actual disadvantage to the owner; in others, that the benefit derived from it is very inconsiderable. It will be necessary for the Guardians to discriminate between the different cases, and to decide in each according to the circumstances, whether they will refuse relief altogether, or grant it either absolutely, or upon condition that the applicant shall dispose of his property. *August* 21, 1851.

ASSISTANT OVERSEER GAVE AN ORDER FOR MEDICAL RELIEF TO THE SICK WIFE OF AN ABLE-BODIED MAN WHO RENTS A HOUSE OF £10 A-YEAR, KEEPS TWO COWS, AND IS IN CONSTANT WAGES AT 10D. PER DAY.

9. It is the duty of the Medical Officer to attend cases such as that alluded to by you if so directed by the Board of Guardians, or by the Overseer, or of Relieving

Officers. The Board of Guardians are, however, the judges of the destitution of the person, and if satisfied that he is not in a condition to need medical relief at the expense of the ratepayers, the Guardians may, and ought to direct the Medical Officer not to attend the person on their account. *May* 8, 1846.

LIABILITY OF RELATIVES TO FURNISH RELIEF.

RELIEF TO FATHER AND DAUGHTER SEPARATELY, THEY LIVING TOGETHER.

10. Relief to a child, after such child has attained the age of sixteen, is not relief to the father, under 4 & 5 Wm. 4, c. 76, sec. 56, though the father is still under a legal obligation to support his daughter if he is of sufficient ability to do so (43 Eliz. c. 2, sec. 7); consequently, the destitution of the daughter in the present case being altogether distinct from the destitution of the father, the Board think that their applications for relief were properly considered by the Guardians as independent applications, and that the charge of such relief should, in each of the two cases, be kept distinct from the other. *January* 25, 1850.

LIABILITY OF FATHER UNDER 43 ELIZ. C. 2, S. 7, TO MAINTAIN HIS DAUGHTER WITH AN ILLEGITIMATE CHILD.

11. The Board presume that during the short period immediately preceding and succeeding the delivery of her child, a woman may be considered to be an impotent person, or one not able to work, within the meaning of the 43 Eliz. c. 2, sec. 7, so that an order might be obtained upon the parent for her maintenance during that time: but, when she recovered from the confinement consequent upon her delivery, so as to be no longer unable to work, her case would not be within the above cited Statute. The father of the woman would not be liable to pay any money for the maintenance of her illegitimate child. *December* 7, 1850.

PARENTS.—LIABILITY TO MAINTAIN CHILDREN ABOVE THE AGE OF SIXTEEN.

12. The 56th sec. of the 4 & 5 Wm. 4, c. 76, merely provides that relief given to children under sixteen years of age shall be considered as given to their parents; but it does not otherwise affect, in any way, the liabilities of parents in respect of their children's support. Indeed, the proviso to that section expressly guards against it being construed to interfere with the enactments of the 43 Eliz. c. 2, in this behalf. If, therefore, a parent neglects to maintain any of his children, who may be above the age of sixteen years, and may be unable to work, the provisions of the 43 Eliz. c. 2, may be resorted to, supposing the parent to be of sufficient ability to maintain such child. Moreover, in such a case, proceedings might be taken against the parent, under the 3rd sec. of the Vagrant Act (5 Geo. 4, c. 83), if the child, in consequence of the parent's neglect, becomes chargeable to the parish, assuming that such child is a part of the parent's family at the time, and be one whom such parent is, by the Statute of Elizabeth, bound to maintain. If it be found (as your letters appears to indicate) that it is becoming a practice in the Kingsclere Union for parents, able and liable to maintain their children, to take advantage of the exemption which they may erroneously suppose the 56th sec. of the 4th & 5th Wm. 4, c. 76, confers upon them, it is a question for the grave consideration of the Guardians, whether it would not be advisable to take proceedings, either under the 43 Eliz. c. 2, or under the 5 Geo. 4, c. 83, in some selected case or cases, with the view of making an example, and showing practically that the parent's liability for the support of his child under the limitation already pointed out, is not limited in law to the age of sixteen years. *March* 13, 1848.

WHETHER FATHER LIABLE FOR RELIEF GIVEN TO ABLE-BODIED SON, AGED 16.

13. Relief given to the son cannot, in this instance, be considered as relief to the father, inasmuch as the son is 16 years of age; the former, therefore, is not liable for the cost of the relief in question (see 4 and 5 Wm. 4, c. 76, sec. 56). Neither can an order of maintenance be, in this instance, obtained against the father, inasmuch as the pauper in question being able to work, does not come within the 7th sec. of the 43 Eliz. c. 2 (see Rex. *v.* Gully), Bott, 366. The Board have to add, that the pauper being able-bodied is within the Prohibitory Order, and, consequently, cannot be relieved out of the Workhouse. *May* 17, 1849.

RELIEF TO A PERSON AGED TWENTY-TWO, LIVING WITH HER FATHER.

14. As the pauper is above the age of sixteen, she is to be regarded for the purposes of relief as not forming part of her father's family; and her application should, therefore, be dealt with as an independent application, and as made on her own account (sec. 56, 4 & 5 Wm. 4, cap. 76). The Board do not, however, see any sufficient reason to regard the provision above-cited, as interfering with the liability created by 43 Eliz. cap. 2, sec. 7, and 59 Geo. 3, cap. 12, sec. 26, upon parents to maintain their children, or as in any way altering the conditions or circumstances under which the liability could be enforced. On the contrary, it will be seen that the concluding proviso to the 56th sec. expressly preserves the statutory liabilities of parents in respect of the support of their children. There is nothing in the language of 43 Eliz. cap. 2, sec. 7, and 59 Geo. 3, cap. 12, sec. 26, to limit the liability of the parent to the case where the child is actually resident with the parent. However, the question will arise in each case, whether the parent has the requisite ability to maintain, for the statutes make that a necessary condition to the making of the order by the justices. If, therefore, in such a case as you have put, the father is practicably unable to support his child of the age of sixteen years, the Board do not see what remedy the parish could have against him; for the same question would arise in a proceeding against the father under the Vagrant Act, 5 Geo. 4, cap. 83, sec. 3; the ability to maintain on the part of the head of the family being in like manner necessary to be shown in order to constitute the omission to maintain an offence. *February* 18, 1848.

RELIEF TO A MAN WHOSE WIFE IS IN THE RECEIPT OF GOOD EARNINGS.

15. The Board are not aware that the Guardians have any legal remedy available whereby they can compel the man's wife to contribute towards his support. They think that, the man being destitute, the Guardians would not be justified in discharging him from the Workhouse, on the ground that his wife has an independent income, so long as she refuses to contribute any portion of it towards his support. *May* 11, 1855.

NON-LIABILITY OF A WIFE TO MAINTAIN HER HUSBAND AND CHILD.

16. A wife is not liable to be proceeded against under the Vagrant Act for refusing or neglecting to maintain her husband, inasmuch as she is not under any legal obligation to support him. So also as regards the child, the legal obligation to maintain it attaches to the husband as the head of the family, and the wife cannot therefore be proceeded against for the desertion. *June* 20, 1844.

RELATIONS.—MAINTENANCE OF.

17. In every case in which an order on a person for the support of a relation is sought to be obtained under the 43 Eliz. c. 2, it appears to be necessary to show that such relation is not only poor, but also unable to work (R. *v.* Gulley, 1 Bott); but the Commissioners believe that it has never been required that the state of the pauper should be one of absolute inability to work,—it being always considered, and acted on in practice, that if the party is not able to work to the extent of getting his own living, he comes within the reason and effect of the provision. *February* 9, 1844.

LIABILITY OF CHILDREN TO MAINTAIN PARENTS.

18. Firstly.—Both of the sons of Richard Liddell are liable to contribute to the support of their parent, if they are of sufficient ability. The justices can, therefore, in their discretion, make an order on each of the sons to contribute such weekly sum, as, in the opinion of the justices, might be his fair proportion of the charge of maintenance. The order should be several. Secondly.—The Commissioners think the most advisable course will be to summon the parties upon whom it is sought to make the order of maintenance, to appear before the justices. *June* 6, 1844.

RELATIVES.—ORDERS FOR THE SUPPORT OF.

19. On the first point, the Commissioners desire to remark, that a brother is not among the relatives enumerated in the statute; which applies only to fathers, grandfathers, mothers, grandmothers, and children. Consequently, a brother is not liable under the statute for the maintenance of his brother. And, accordingly, this point was so decided in the case of R. *v.* Smith (2 Car. and P. 449). With respect to the second question, the Commissioners think that a woman whose husband is living is not compellable to maintain her father. Having no property of her own, she herself is clearly not a person "of sufficient ability," within the meaning of the statute. And it has been decided, in similar cases, that the husband is not liable, on the ground that the statute extends only to natural relations, and not to relations by marriage (See R. *v.* Munden, 1 Bott 447; R. *v.* Munday, 1 Bott 448.) *September* 5, 1843.

SICKNESS OR ACCIDENT TO A YEARLY SERVANT.

20. Sickness does not put an end to the contract of service, but it has been decided that a master is not bound (in the absence of any agreement to that effect) to provide medical or surgical assistance for his servant. There may be cases, therefore, in which persons in service, as agricultural labourers or otherwise, may be unable to obtain medical aid at their own charge, and destitute of friends who are able or willing to assist them. In any such case, if application be made to the Guardians for medical relief, the Commissioners cannot say that the application should be refused. If the Guardians or other competent authority order the relief, the Medical Officer is bound to afford it.

SERVANTS.—Maintenance of in Sickness.

21. In the absence of any agreement on the subject, a master is not bound to provide his servant with medical attendance, if the latter fall sick during the period of service. There may be cases in which the earnings of a yearly-hired servant are so small as to be obviously insufficient to enable him to procure medical attendance at his own cost. The question, whether the Guardians, in any particular case, can grant medical relief to a domestic servant, must be determined upon a consideration of the circumstances of such case,—for example, the liability of the master under any agreement, or the ability of the servant himself, to provide or procure medical aid, independently of the parish. This is a question for the Guardians themselves to decide, upon their knowledge of the facts, though it may be observed generally, that the circumstance of a person being in service and earning wages, raises a presumption against the necessity of his resorting to the parish. *June* 11, 1844.

RELIEF TO A YEARLY-HIRED SERVANT IN SICKNESS.

22. In the case of a yearly-hired servant, if he fall sick during that period, the master is not entitled to put the servant away, or abate his wages. (Dalt. c. 58, p. 141; R. *v.* Subbrooke, 1 Smith's Rep. 59.) But though he cannot refuse to support his servant under such circumstances, the master is not bound to provide his servant with medical attendance or with medicines (see Sellon *v.* Norman, 4 C. and P. 80. Newby *v.* Wiltshire, 2 Esp. 739, and other cases). There may be cases in which the earnings of a yearly-hired servant are so small, as to be obviously insufficient to enable him to procure medical attendance at his own cost. The Commissioners, therefore, are not prepared to say that, in every case of this kind which can be conceived, relief at the cost of the poor rates would be improperly afforded. But, as a general rule, the Commissioners do not think that persons in the situation and circumstances described, can be considered as proper objects for relief, and such as ought to receive medical aid at the charge of the poor rates. If, however, the Guardians should consider that the circumstances were such as to warrant them in providing medical aid to J. B., they are clearly not liable in law to the demand made upon them by the master for the cost of his maintenance and the nurse's charges. *March* 4, 1845.

RELIEF BY WAY OF LOANS.

23. A Surgeon laid claim for his attendance, which the Guardians loaned to the poor, this the Commissioners refused, saying "that the condition thus annexed to the grant is not intended for the benefit of the party who may actually supply the relief, except so far as it may operate as a test to prevent undue applications. The Commissioners cannot assume that the Guardians have, in any case, given orders for medical relief improperly." *Dec.* 13, 1847.

24. The Commissioners conceive that, in determining whether relief should or should not be given by way of loan, in any particular case, the Board of Guardians should bear in mind that they must decide with reference to the man's general ability to repay the relief advanced to him; and in determining whether he is capable of refunding the loan, the Guardians should not be guided by any one

particular circumstance connected with the case, but by a full consideration of all the circumstances, of which the question of a man's being single or married must obviously form a part only. *January* 25, 1843.

25. Provided it be understood at the time that the relief is given by way of loan, it is not necessary, in order to enable the Guardians to recover it, that there should have been any engagement, upon the part of the pauper, for its repayment. (4 and 5 Will. IV., c. 76, sec. 58.) 1856.

LOAN IN MIDWIFERY CASES.

26. Medical assistance only forms a part of relief to the destitute poor, and the same rules and principles apply to it as those which are applicable to any other kind of relief. The Board usually recommend the Guardians, as the midwifery fee allowed to Medical Officers is an extra one, to cause it to be understood that relief of the nature in question will be granted by way of loan; and that the repayment of the whole, or of such parts of the fee as the Guardians might determine, would be rigidly enforced by them, and to direct the Relieving Officer to notify the fact to every one who may apply to him for an order. *May* 2, 1856.

CHILDBIRTH.—MEDICAL RELIEF TO THE WIFE OF A MAN WHO GENERALLY EARNS 18s. PER WEEK, BUT IS NOW OUT OF WORK.

27. Relief may be given by way of loan, in which case it is necessary that the relief be declared to be a loan at the time it is given, and that the pauper be at the same time so informed. *May*, 1846.

RELIEF TO THE FAMILIES OF THOSE IN HER MAJESTY'S SERVICE.

RELIEF TO THE FAMILY OF A MAN WHO HAS ENTERED THE ARMY.

28. Unless the authorities of the War Office can interfere under the circumstances to protect the parish by requiring a part of the husband's pay to be applied to the maintenance of his family, the Commissioners are not aware that there is any available remedy. The Commissioners have reason to believe that it is not the practice of the War Office so to interfere. The Commissioners are advised that the husband is protected by the provisions of the Mutiny Act from being proceeded against for the offence of deserting his family and suffering them to become chargeable. If the wife have not the means of supporting herself and family, the Guardians will do right in giving needful relief. *February* 23, 1846.

RELIEF TO THE FAMILIES OF MILITIAMEN.

29. The Board are of opinion, that relief should be afforded to the applicants, if destitute, in like manner as to other destitute persons within the Union. The Board consider the cases to be within exception 7 to Art. 1 of the General Prohibitory Order; and it is therefore in the discretion of the Guardians to grant out-relief if they think it desirable to do so. Every case, however, should be considered with reference to its particular circumstances, and it is competent to the Guardians, where they see fit, to grant relief only in the Workhouse, or to grant it by way of loan. With regard to the fact that it is voluntary on the part of the men to enter the service, the Board desire to point out, that the case does not differ in this respect from that of men enlisting in the army. The material consideration for the Guardians, therefore, seems to be, whether or not that pay which a militiaman, while on duty, receives, is sufficient, after providing for his own wants, and such necessary expenses as the proper discharge of his public duties may entail upon him, to support his family. If it be not sufficient, the Board consider that the Guardians cannot properly refuse, where application for relief is made by the wife, to grant such relief as the actual necessities of the family may, in the opinion of the Guardians, render needful. *May* 22, 1854.

MILITIAMEN.—NON-LIABILITY TO PUNISHMENT UNDER VAGRANT ACT, FOR LEAVING THEIR FAMILIES CHARGEABLE.

30. The Board are of opinion that militiamen are not liable to punishment under the Vagrant Act, for neglecting, while they are out on service, to maintain their families. The Board are further of opinion that the pay of such militiamen cannot lawfully be stopped in order to be applied towards the maintenance of their families. The Guardians, however, can grant relief to the families on loan, and recover the amount of such loan by process out of the County Court when the men return from duty. *June* 29, 1854.

RELIEF TO THE FAMILY OF A SOLDIER WHILE HE IS ON FOREIGN SERVICE.

31. The law does not supply any means whereby the pay of a soldier can be attached under the circumstances referred to. *April* 14, 1855.

RECOVERY OF RELIEF TO FAMILY OF SEAMEN.

32. As at present advised, the Commissioners are disposed to think that the 12th section of 7 & 8 Vic. c. 112 (the terms of which are very comprehensive), would prevent the recovery of relief granted to the family of a seaman in his absence, either by the proceeding contemplated by sec. 32 of 59 Geo. 3, c. 12, which applies to the recovery of relief not given on loan, or by the proceeding under 59th sec. 4 & 5 Wm. 4, c. 76, which is applicable to the recovery of relief given on loan by the Guardians. The 12th sec. of 7 & 8 Vic. c. 112, provides, that no assignment which may have been made of wages, nor any attachment or incumbrance thereon, nor any attachment to be issued from any court whatever, shall prevent the payment of wages to any seaman by the master or owner. The order of the justices, made under sec. 32 of 59 Geo. 3, c. 12, and that made under 59th section of 4 & 5 Wm. 4, c. 76, is certainly an attachment, or incumbrance, on the wages of the person to whom, or on whose account, or to whose family, the relief was given. The Commissioners entertain great doubt whether any remedy for the recovery of relief given on loan, in cases such as you describe, exists in the County Court. But the Guardians may, if an opportunity occur, obtain the judgment of the judge of that court without much risk or cost. *December* 13, 1847.

DUTIES OF A MEDICAL OFFICER IN REGARD TO PAUPERS BELONGING TO CLUBS.

33. The Board consider that, whenever the Medical Officer receives an order given by the Guardians or Relieving Officer, he is bound to attend the person to whom the order has reference (a person in receipt of 7s. a week from a Club), without in the first instance entering into a consideration of the question whether such person ought, in the Officer's opinion, to be relieved by the Guardians or not. The Board think it right to add, however, that any information which the Medical Officer may possess or obtain with regard to the means and resources of the pauper may very properly be brought by him under the notice of the Guardians, whose province it is to decide as to the destitution of the applicants for relief. The Board quite admit that the Guardians have no right to employ you in attending any but poor persons in the sense of the Art. 206, No. 1 of the General Cons. Order. *November* 10, 1849.

MEDICAL RELIEF TO PERSONS WHO ARE IN CLUBS.

34. A person labouring under dangerous illness, and unable to obtain the medical assistance he requires, is legally entitled to medical relief. (R. *v.* Warren, R. and Ry., 48, a.) The Commissioners understand by this, however, that he must be destitute of the means of procuring the necessary medical assistance. If, therefore, he belongs to a club, or has made other provisions through which he can actually obtain medical assistance in cases of urgency, the Commissioners consider that, when such a case arises, he is not destitute in the above sense. The Commissioners think that if a man is properly attended by the surgeon of the works (Club) in that capacity, medical or surgical relief may be refused by the Union so long as he is entitled to, and actually obtains, the assistance of the surgeon. *February* 13. 1844.

RELIEF TO MEMBERS OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.—(Copy of a Minute of Poor Law Commissioners.)

35. If the applicant has the right to the attendance of a medical man and medicines, in respect of his belonging to a Friendly Society, this will, of course, not be one of the wants to be provided for by the Guardians. If he has not this right the Guardians will give him medical relief in the same manner as it would be given to any other person unable to provide it for himself.

In the administration of medical relief in this class of cases (members of Friendly Societies), the Commissioners recommend to the Guardians that they should in general give the relief by way of loan, and enforce strict attention to the recovery of the loan by installments, however small, after the party relieved has returned to his labour.

If the system of giving medical relief by way of loan be gradually adopted, those who find that they will have ultimately to pay for the relief which they obtain from the poor's rates, will find it to be so obviously their interest to have recourse to Medical Clubs or Friendly Societies, or other similar institutions, that the Commissioners look forward with confidence to the increase and prosperity of institutions of this nature, and to the consequent growth of forethought and frugality amongst the labouring classes.

The Commissioners in their quotation of the Highland Society of Scotland, say, "*but above all, they had the benefit of medical advice without any expense in the particular case; and being thereby induced to make early application, disease was cut short at once on its first appearance.*" *April* 4, 1840.

MEDICAL RELIEF TO NON-RESIDENT POOR.

36. The Guardians are bound to give medical as well as all other relief which may be necessary to destitute persons, resident in the Union, whether they belong to any parish of the Union or not. The fees payable to Medical Officers in surgical cases, and cases of midwifery, can only be recovered under a suspended order of removal, or where there is an agreement on the part of such parish to repay the same. *July*, 1844.

JUSTICE'S POWER TO ORDER MEDICAL RELIEF.

37. The Commissioners think that the 54th sec. of the Poor Law Amendment Act enables a Justice of the Peace to give an order for medical relief (only) in any case of sudden and dangerous illness, in which such relief may be requisite, whether the Overseers have or have not previously refused to give such relief. The first proviso in the section clearly refers to the immediately antecedent clause, requiring Overseers to give relief "in cases of sudden and urgent necessity," and it limits the Justice's power in such cases to those instances in which the Overseer refuses or neglects to perform his duty. But the second proviso has reference to a different class of cases, and empowers the Justice to give an order for medical relief, &c., where any case of sudden and dangerous illness may require it. Some doubt may possibly arise from the description of the order, in the second proviso, as a similar order, but the Commissioners apprehend that this expression was intended to indicate merely the character of the order itself, and not the occasion for its issuing.

The Commissioners consider that the phrase "similar order" has the effect of requiring that the order for medical relief, under the second proviso, should be, like the order for temporary relief, in articles of necessity, authorized by the first requiring that the order for medical relief, under the second proviso should be proviso; that is to say, that it should be made upon the Overseer of the parish, by a Justice of the Peace, in writing, under his hand and seal.

The Justice, before granting an order for medical relief, need not call upon the Overseer to show cause why he refused to give such relief; although of course, he will be bound to satisfy himself that the case is really one of illness so sudden and dangerous as to justify his making an order on the Overseer. *March*, 1844.

A JUSTICE HAS NO LEGAL POWER TO MAKE ANY ORDER UPON A RELIEVING OFFICER FOR RELIEF IN RESPECT OF ANY PERSON, WHETHER A PAUPER OR OTHERWISE.

38. A Justice may order an Overseer to give relief in cases specified in the Poor Law Amendment Act (4 & 5 Wm. 4, c. 76, sec. 54). With regard to parishes where the poor are still maintained under the 43rd Eliz. c. 2, the larger powers given to Justices over Overseers by the 3rd Wm. & Mary, c. 11, and the 9 Geo. 1, c. 7, still remain. *April*, 1850.

POWER OF OVERSEERS OR ASSISTANT OVERSEERS TO GRANT MEDICAL ORDERS.

ASSISTANT OVERSEER'S REFUSAL TO GIVE A MEDICAL ORDER.

39. A case of inflammation of the breast had ended in suppuration, and the matter had found its way through the skin before the medical order could be procured from the Assistant Overseer.

A case of considerable flooding, producing great weakness and dropsical effusion, not only into the cellular membrane of the legs, but also into the body, before the order for medical relief was given by the Relieving Officer, the Assistant Overseer having refused to give it.

The Poor Law Board are informed that at the time the Assistant Overseer refused orders for the Medical Officer's attendance upon these two cases, the circumstances were clearly of a "sudden and urgent" character, and that therefore, in these two instances, you have failed to fulfil the duties of your office. The Board consider, that an order for the attendance of the Medical Officer is such relief as an Assistant Overseer may give, under the authority of the section referred to; but before you avail yourself of the power which it confers upon you, you will be bound to satisfy yourself that the case is really one of "sudden and urgent necessity," that is to say, of such pressing exigency as not to admit of the delay which might arise in referring to the ordinary source of relief, viz., the Board of Guardians or the Relieving Officer. *Nov.* 29, 1849.

AN OVERSEER CAN ONLY ORDER RELIEF IN CASES OF SUDDEN AND URGENT NECESSITY.

40. Where an Overseer, in the proper exercise of the duties of his office, does in any such case give an order for medical relief, the Medical Officer is bound to attend the pauper in whose favour it is given. If the case is one of midwifery, then the Medical Officer would be entitled to the proper fee. If the Overseer had no authority so to interfere, it would not come within the terms of the contract, though the Medical Officer might perhaps have a personal remedy against the Overseer who gave him the order. If there is any doubt of the "sudden and urgent necessity," the Medical Officer, who is one of the contracting parties, is bound to clear it up, so as to show that he is entitled to the fee claimed in such case. The Overseers also have an interest in doing so, because, having given an order, they are apparently liable to the Medical Officer, if he cannot recover the fee under the contract. *July* 15, 1848.

41. Overseers have not the right to inspect Medical Relief Book. *April* 27, 1852.

ELECTION AND QUALIFICATION OF MEDICAL OFFICERS.

ELECTION OF PAID OFFICERS NOT VALID UNLESS A MAJORITY OF THE GUARDIANS, PRESENT AT THE MEETING, VOTE FOR A CANDIDATE.

42. The Clerk of the Pewsey Union forwarded the following extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Guardians, held on the 21st April, 1856:—"The clerk reported that he had forwarded to the Poor Law Board an extract from the minutes of the last meeting of the Guardians relative to the appointment of Mr. Carter, as Medical Officer for the Netheravon district; and the clerk read a letter, dated the 11th instant, received by him from the Poor Law Board, in which they stated that, by the provisions of Art. 155 of the General Consolidated Order, it was essential that the majority of the Guardians present at the meeting at which an officer was appointed should concur in such appointment; and as it appeared that, although twenty Guardians were present at the meeting on the 7th instant, only eight voted for Mr. Carter. Under such circumstances no valid appointment of a Medical Officer took place. It was proposed by Mr. Jenner, seconded by Mr. Martin, and agreed, that the clerk write to the Poor Law Board, and draw their attention to Note G., annexed to Art. 155 of Mr. Glen's Third Edition of the Consolidated Order, which Note states, that Guardians present, and not voting, are to be considered as virtually acquiescing in the decision of the majority of those who vote (Oldham *v.* Wainwright, 2 Burr, 1,017), and ask, if the Poor Law Board still considered that no valid appointment of a Medical Officer took place on the 7th instant.

The Board refer the Guardians to the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in Exparte Eynsham, 12 Ad. & Ell., New Series, p. 398; and the Q. *v.* Griffiths, 17 & Ad. Ell., New Series, p. 164. According to those decisions, the Board think that it must be held that Art. 155 of the General Consolidated Order requires that a majority of all the Guardians actually present at the meeting should be given in favour of a candidate before he can be regarded as duly elected; consequently, those Guardians who, although present, do not vote, must nevertheless be counted, with a view of ascertaining the majority of the whole body. The Board, therefore, adhere to the opinion which they have already expressed, that no valid appointment of a Medical Officer for the Netheravon District has yet taken place. *May* 1, 1856.

QUALIFICATION OF MEDICAL OFFICERS.

43 We are of opinion that, as far as the question of surgery is concerned, those persons who have a surgical diploma or degree from a Royal College or

University in Scotland or Ireland, are (in point of law) as competent to be appointed and to act as Medical Officers, under the 4 & 5 Wm. 4, cap. 76, as the persons who have the diploma of the Royal College in London.

With respect to pharmacy, the right to practise in England and Wales is confined to those who have the license or certificate of the Apothecaries Company, and other persons whose rights are saved by the Apothecaries Acts; and in our opinion, persons having Scotch and Irish medical degrees are not among such last-named persons.

FREDERICK POLLOCK,
SAMUEL MARTIN.

August 8, 1843.

44. The Commissioners learn that the term "*extra-licentiate Physicians*" applies to licentiates of the College who may practise in any part of England, excepting the precinct of London. The power of the *extra-licentiates* to practise physic within the limits specified, is as full and as complete as that possessed by licentiates who may practise within the precincts of London; it appears to the Commissioners that they come within the meaning of the Medical Order (Art. 3, No. 1), *i.e.*, that the license to practise physic, coupled with the diploma of the Royal College of Surgeons, would confer on the persons possessing them the legal qualification for Medical Officer in any Union or Parish in England or Wales, in which the Medical Order is in force, and which is not included in the precincts of London; *i.e.*, in the city of London and within seven miles of it. *April* 20, 1844.

45. The Senate of the London University have, by the Queen's Charter of 26th Dec., 1837, the power to confer the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Doctor of Medicine. There appears, therefore, to be no question that persons holding the diploma of Doctor or Bachelor of Medicine of this University, together with a diploma from the London College of Surgeons, are qualified, under the Commissioners' Order, Art. 3, paragraph 1, to be a Medical Officer of a Parish or Union. *July*, 1842.

46. A person possessing a diploma of the College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, merely places such person in the position of one who is a member of the Royal College of Surgeons of London, and does not qualify him to be appointed a Medical Officer under the General Medical Order, except under circumstances, described in Articles 4 and 5 of the order. *March* 11, 1844.

47. The full qualification can only be dispensed with under the circumstances mentioned in Art. 169 of the General Regulations. Art. 170 merely had the effect of enabling Medical Officers, who were not fully qualified, but who were permanently appointed before the Regulations were issued, to retain their offices. *February* 15, 1855.

QUALIFICATION OF MEDICAL SUBSTITUTES.

48. The Commissioner stated that it was not necessary that the substitutes should have any of the double qualifications required by the order, in the case of the Medical Officers themselves; it being sufficient that the substitutes should be legally qualified to practice medicine. *February* 16, 1843.

MEDICAL DUTIES PERFORMED BY ASSISTANT OR APPRENTICE.

49. The Board are not prepared to say that in ordinary cases the Medical Officer may not employ, under his own superintendence, his assistant or apprentice to visit the sick paupers under his care; but they most distinctly point out that his doing so would not in any degree relieve him from any portion of the responsibility attaching to the discharge of the duties of his office.

The Board think it incumbent on the Medical Officer to be extremely cautious with women in childbirth, and they would remark that in such cases, if he cannot attend himself, he should send his appointed substitute, rather than his assistant or apprentice. *April* 4, 1848.

MEANING OF "DULY QUALIFIED" MEDICAL PRACTITIONER IN THE NUISANCE REMOVAL ACT.

50. The term used in the Act 9 and 10 Vic., c. 96, "duly qualified Medical Practitioner" is very vague, and has not any definite legal meaning. The Commissioners believe the law has assigned qualifications to Apothecaries and Physicians, and to Surgeons within a limited district. The Commissioners are disposed to think, therefore, that the Legislature must have referred to the persons who are so qualified, rather than to persons who have no qualification recognized by law. *September* 7, 1847.

PERSONS INELIGIBLE TO HOLD THE OFFICE OF MEDICAL OFFICER.

HOMŒOPATHIST.

51. The Poor Law Board believe that the Homœopathic system has not yet been recognized by any of the constituted medical authorities of the country; and they therefore would not feel themselves justified in consenting to any arrangement by which the sick poor of any district would be confided to the care of a Medical Officer who adopted that system exclusively.

A DISMISSED POOR LAW MEDICAL OFFICER IS INELIGIBLE TO CONTINUE THE OFFICE OF REGISTRAR OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

52. A Medical Officer of a Poor Law Union, who being also a Registrar of Births and Deaths, being dismissed from his office of Medical Officer by an Order of the Poor Law Commissioners, is, in the Registrar-General's opinion, clearly ineligible to retain the situation of Registrar of a temporary district adjoining such Union, it being provided, by Sec. 8 of the Registration Act, that any person so removed shall "cease to hold office" under that Act, and be incapable of re-appointment thereto. *November*, 1841.

CORONER AND MEDICAL OFFICER.

53. The Commissioners are in the habit of considering the two offices of Coroner and Medical Officer as incompatible; and that they did not think it desirable that he should continue to hold both. *May* 20, 1845.

PERSONS INELIGIBLE TO ACT AS GUARDIANS.

A PUBLIC VACCINATOR INELIGIBLE AS GUARDIAN.

54. The Board are of opinion that a medical man who receives payments for the performance of vaccination, under the usual contract entered into with the Board of Guardians of the Union, is to be regarded as receiving "a fixed salary or emolument from the poor rate," so as to be incapable of serving as a Guardian in such Union, under sec. 14 of the 5 & 6 Vic., c. 57. The source of the payment is the poor rate, the payment is an "emolument," and it appears to the Board to be a "fixed emolument," within the meaning of the Act, as it is "fixed" in proportion to the service, although not as to the whole amount. The principle upon which the disqualification is founded appears to be in every respect applicable to the case, the office of Guardian being one which involves the duty of seeing to performance of the duty of the person who contracts to vaccinate, and, consequently, one which enables a Guardian, if so inclined, to give effect to his partiality to the contractor, to the disadvantage of the public. The Board consider that the disqualification applies as well to an *ex-officio* as to an elected Guardian. 1856.

MEDICAL OFFICER CANNOT ACT AS AN EX-OFFICIO GUARDIAN.

55. The mere fact of your being a Justice of the Peace for the county does not prevent your continuing to hold the office of Medical Officer of the ——— Union. But the Board consider you to be prevented from serving as an ex-officio Guardian, a Medical Officer being a paid officer engaged in the administration of the Poor Laws, within the 14th sec. of the 5 & 6 Vic., c. 57, which appears to the Board to apply to ex-officio as well as to elected Guardians. *April* 12, 1848.

BOROUGH MAGISTRATES ARE NOT, AS SUCH, EX-OFFICIO GUARDIANS.

56. The Commissioners stated that they had been advised, and were of opinion, that the magistrates of a corporate town were not entitled to be considered nor to act as *ex-officio* Guardians. By the 38th sec., Poor Law Amendment Act, the *ex-officio* Guardians were required to be Justices of the Peace residing in any such parish and acting for the county, riding, or division in which the same might be situate. The word "division," when used in conjunction with county and riding, as decided by the case of Evans *v.* Stephens, 4 T. R. 224, 459, did not include cities, boroughs, cinque ports, and such jurisdictions.

With regard to the supposed effect of the definition of the words Justices of the Peace in the 109th sec., Poor Law Amendment Act, the Commissioners considered that no authority was afforded by that definition for the construction in favour of the right of Justices of boroughs or towns (not being counties) to be

ex-officio Guardians. That section provided that the words "Justice or Justices of the Peace" should be construed to "include Justices of the Peace of any county, division of a county, riding, borough, liberty, division of a liberty, precinct, county of a city, county of a town, cinque port, or town corporate, *unless where otherwise provided by this Act.*" If the word "Justices" in the 38th sec. had been used without any limitation or qualification, the Commissioners thought that it might, with reference to the 109th sec., have been reasonably held to include every species of justice, and therefore Justices of a corporate town. But it *was* "otherwise provided," in the 38th sec., the Justices therein referred to being termed "Justices of a division." It appeared, therefore, to the Commissioners that the word "Justices," as there used, having a specific meaning or qualification attached to it, did not include Justices who were not within the limitations, *i.e.*, who were not "Justices of the division." *Dec.* 10, 1841.

Liability for illegally acting as Guardian.

57. 5 & 6, Vic., c. 57, sec. 14. And be it enacted, that no person, during the time for which he may serve or hold the office of Assistant Overseer of any parish, nor any paid Officer engaged in the administration of the laws for the relief of the poor, nor any person who, having been a paid Officer, shall have been dismissed within five years previously from such office, under the provisions of the said recited Act, shall be capable of serving as a Guardian * * * * * * * * * and no person receiving any fixed salary or emolument from the poor rates in any Parish or Union, shall be capable of serving as a Guardian in such Parish or Union. The Commissioners deem it right to observe that if any person, to whom the above clause is applicable, shall henceforth wilfully act as a Guardian, he will render himself liable to the usual penalties of violating the provisions of a statute. *August* 2, 1842.

Accidents attended by other than the District Medical Officer.

58. The Commissioners are of opinion that, in cases of sickness or accident requiring immediate medical or surgical attendance, and when the services of the Medical Officer cannot be promptly obtained, the Relieving Officer may employ any other medical man to attend the case. (Art. 20, No. 3, order *April* 21, 1842.)

They also think that in a case of urgency of this nature, in which, in the absence of the Medical Officer, another medical man attends without any order, the Guardians would be justified in paying him for such attendance; provided they subsequently decide that the person so attended was at the time in a destitute condition. As to the amount of the charge for the medical attendance in such a case, that must depend upon the circumstances of each case, and must be settled between the medical man and the Guardians. The fees prescribed by Arts. 10 and 13 of the General Medical Order refer to Medical Officers only. The Commissioners wish to add, that when a medical man (not being a Medical Officer) attends a pauper under the circumstances above described, the Relieving Officer should visit the case as soon as he is made acquainted with it; and the Medical Officer should be directed to attend the case, and relieve the medical man who had attended in his absence from the charge of it as soon as practicable. *March* 8, 1843.

Relief in cases of Emergency.

59. That if a Medical Officer was sent for to attend a poor person, and he accepted the case, and treated the person in any way as his patient, and as being under his care, the Commissioners would not allow the circumstance that there was no written order from a Relieving Officer, Overseer, or other authority, to be a justification of neglect of the case by the Medical Officer, or to protect him from the consequences of such neglect * * * *

The reasons for this construction I stated to be as follows: namely, that if the Medical Officer makes no objection to attending the case, but proceeds, or promises to proceed, in the treatment of it, he causes reliance to be placed upon his services by those who apply for his assistance, and so prevents their obtaining an order from some competent authority, or from applying for assistance in some other quarter. *April* 8, 1842.

Medical Officer to advise Overseers of their duty.

60. The Medical Officer must give his advice to the Overseers as to persons fully competent, in cases of urgency, to incur any reasonable expense in providing lodging as well as other necessaries. *April* 8, 1842.

Remuneration in severe Surgical Cases not named in the Order.

61. As a general rule, the Medical Officer's remuneration for his attendance in all surgical cases not mentioned in Art. 10 of the Medical Order (severe burns), must be considered as included in his fixed salary. If, however, in any special case, not mentioned in that article, the Guardians should be of opinion that the Medical Officer is fairly entitled to some extra remuneration, the Commissioners think that the Guardians would be justified in paying the Medical Officer such additional remuneration as the circumstances of the case might render proper. *January*, 1844.

Medical Officer's Fee where two Medical Men attended the Patient.

62. The Board are of opinion that the Relieving Officer did not act correctly in sending the order to the Medical Officer of the district in which the accident happened, it should have been addressed to the Medical Officer of that district wherein the man was at the time when the relief was required. As regards the fee for reducing the fracture, under the circumstances set forth, it is certainly not payable to the District Medical Officer who was not called in; neither is the Medical Officer who came out of his district entitled, as a matter of right, to the fee prescribed under the General Consolidated Order, although he is entitled to a reasonable compensation for the service rendered. *July* 16, 1849.

Fee for a Surgical Case which was attended successively by two Medical Men.—To whom Payable.

63. A attended a fractured thigh for 14 days, when he resigned, and B took charge of the case. The Commissioners think that A is entitled to the entire fee, and that it cannot be apportioned between the two Officers. The Commissioners would observe that, in cases of this sort, an arrangement ought to be made by the Guardians that the former Medical Officer should complete his attendance on the case, notwithstanding the change of Officers. *April* 22, 1841.

Relief in case of Accident to a Man who was not a Pauper.—As to Payment of Expenses of.

64. It appeared to the Commissioners that the apprentice who caused the accident was not liable either to the Guardians or the innkeeper, to whose house the man was taken, but would only have been liable at the suit of the deceased.

That it was competent to the Medical Officer to order the diet, medicines, and nurse for the deceased while the necessity was urgent, and until those things could be supplied by himself and the Relieving Officer, or under the direction of the Board of Guardians; but that he could not order such things continuously without authority from the Board of Guardians. Still, supposing that he did not report the case, if the Guardians did not then disapprove of his conduct, the Commissioners thought that in a case of such urgency it would not be desirable to dispute the bill of the innkeeper, merely on the ground of continuous authority in the Medical Officer. The board of the nurse would appear to be governed by the like consideration as the diet and medicines of the deceased, &c., &c. *November*, 1841.

Amputation.—As to the Necessity of Obtaining a Certificate prior to Performing it. Construction of Proviso in Art. 10.

65. The Commissioners do not consider that the proviso in Art. 10, which requires that the Medical Officer shall produce to the Board of Guardians a certificate, to the effect that it was right and proper that amputation or operation should be performed, is a condition *precedent* to the performance of the operation. *July*, 1845.

Powers of Guardians to Subscribe to Hospitals.

66. That the Guardians of any Union or Parish may, with the consent of the Poor Law Board, pay out of the common fund of such Union, or, in the case of a Parish, out of the funds in the hands of such Guardians any sum of money as annual subscription towards the support and maintenance of any public Hospital or Infirmary for the reception of sick, diseased, or wounded persons, or of persons suffering from any permanent or natural infirmity (14 & 15 Vict. cap. 105, sec. 4).

Removal to a Hospital immediately after Setting a Fracture, no Fee legally Claimable.

67. The Commissioners consider the fee borrowed by Art. 10, is for the "*treatment*" of the fracture, and there is a proviso, as a condition to the payment, that the patient shall have required and have received *several attendances* after the operation by the Medical Officer.

The Commissioners desire to state that they would be prepared to acquiesce in the propriety of the payment of such additional remuneration as mentioned by the Clerk (£1), under the circumstances described wherever it should be recommended by the Guardians. *February*, 1844.

Hospitals.—Cases Requiring Operations to be sent to.

68. The Commissioners stated that they fully concurred in the view taken by the Guardians, "that all cases requiring extraordinary surgical aid should be sent to the Hospital at the earliest possible opportunity (if the circumstances of the cases will, in the opinion of the Medical Officer, admit of such removal), and the Commissioners very much prefer the removal of a patient, whose case may require the performance of a capital operation of surgery, to some good Hospital, to the performance of such an operation in a Workhouse. *May*, 1842.

Refusal of a Patient to submit to an Operation.

69. If any Medical Practitioner (not the Medical Officer of the Workhouse where the patient is) can certify that the pauper is not of sound mind, the Guardians would be justified in authorizing those means to be used which they are informed can alone save life; on the other hand, if the patient is of sound mind, he must be allowed to judge for himself. *February*, 1845.

EXTRA MEDICAL FEES.

Extra Medical Fees.—Where Chargeable.

70. They are in fact payments made in respect of particular paupers, and can therefore be distinctly allocated; and they have always been regarded by the Poor Law Commissioners, as well as by the Board, as relief to the several paupers; and consequently chargeable to the same fund as any other relief to those paupers. They ought, therefore, to be charged to the parish or township; and to the common fund of the Union, if the pauper be irremovable, under the 9 and 10 Vic., cap. 66; or otherwise chargeable to the common fund, under the 11 and 12 Vic., cap. 110.

Compound Fracture.—Definition of.

71. A fracture is called "compound," when the end or ends of the bone or bones have penetrated the soft parts, so as to come in contact with the external air, which alters the whole of the processes set up by nature for the cure of a simple fracture; giving rise, at the same time, to such degree of constitutional irritation as usually leads to the death of old people. The case is rather worse, than better, if the sufferer should have no skin (over the part in consequence of an ulcer), inasmuch as a tear in the skin can sometimes be induced to unite, although rarely, and the case be thus reduced to that of a simple fracture, which I do not apprehend would be the case if muscular and tendinous parts were torn and exposed by the bone without such usual covering. *August*, 1845.

Dislocation of Fracture of Arm.—Definition of.

72. The Commissioners understand that a dislocation of the arm includes a dislocation of the elbow, or of the wrist, as well as the shoulder.

A fracture of the arm includes a fracture of the humerus, radius, or alna, but not a fracture of the scapula, or clavicle. *April*, 1843.

Fracture of the Clavicle, or of the Acromion Scapulæ, Compound Fracture of the Metacarpal Bones.

73. These accidents do not come within the terms of the General Medical Order, Art. 10, and the Medical Officer is not entitled to a special fee under that order for the treatment of them. *July*, 1845.

Fracture of the Leg and the Dislocation of the Ankle.

74. These accidents entitle the Medical Officer to a fee of £3 for each, as they constitute two independent injuries. *Jan.* 30, 1845.

Re-Fracture of a Limb.

75. A Second fracture of a limb, after the splints have been removed, arising from the person getting out of bed, the Commissioners consider does not entitle the Medical Officer to an extra fee, neither does a second fracture occurring in the same place in a man who has left his house on a walk, if the medical man had not ceased his attendance for the first fracture. *July*, 1845.

Fracture of one Bone of the Arm, and a Dislocation at the Elbow Joint of the other Bone.

76. The Commissioners are of opinion that the fracture and the dislocation, in the case described, are two distinct injuries, for each of which the Medical Officer is entitled to be paid the fees prescribed by Art. 10 of the General Medical Order; viz., £1 in each case. The case is different from a fracture of the same bone in two places. *August* 1, 1845.

Double Amputation.

77. The construction which the Board put upon Art. 180 of the General Consolidated Order, as it affects the claim of the Medical Officer, is, that it operates to prevent the payment to him of more than one fee for the amputation which he performed, assuming that two fees became payable at the same time, and in consequence of the same cause or injury. *April*, 1855.

78. Dislocation of the Patella is not within the cases for which fees are prescribed by the Order; but the Commissioners are willing to sanction the allowance of some extra remuneration to the Medical Officer, if the Guardians should wish to make him such an allowance. *July*, 1845.

Lateral Dislocation of the Knee Joint, and an Oblique Simple Fracture of the Tibia and Fibula.

79. Both injuries being in the same leg, entitle the Medical Officer to be paid two fees. *July*, 1845.

Fracture of the Thigh.—Treatment of.

80. The fee prescribed by Art. 177 is for "treatment" of a fracture, that is to say, not only for setting the limb, but also for attendance on the case from the time the accident happens until the patient recovers. The Board therefore consider ——— is not entitled to a fee for merely setting the fracture, but the Guardians may, if they think fit, having first obtained the approval of this Board, make a reasonable compensation for the sources rendered for setting the limb. *August* 30, 1848.

Dislocation of the Ankle is a Dislocation of the Leg.

81. This accident is within the meaning of the Medical Order, and therefore the fee of £3 ought to be paid to the Medical Officer for the treatment of the dislocation. *Jan.*, 1844.

Fracture of Malleolus Externus.

82. The Commissioners are of opinion that a fracture of the malleolus externus must be considered as a simple fracture of the leg, and that the Medical Officer would be entitled to the fee of £3 for his attendance in such a case. *July* 3, 1843.

Fracture of the Thumb.

83. This accident cannot be considered a fracture of the arm, and does not legally entitle to the payment of an extra fee for the treatment of it. *Jan.*, 1846.

Consultations.

84. As regards the application you (Mr. Griffin) have made for an order for three medical men to assist you in the amputation, I am directed to state that the more regular course under circumstances such as you describe (inability to perform the operation without assistance), is, that the Medical Officer himself (where he deems it needful to do so) should obtain any additional professional aid which may, in his judgment, be necessary; and, after the operation has been performed, submit the facts to the Guardians. It then rests with them to determine whether the case was of such an unusual and exceptional character as to warrant them in making a special allowance for the assistance so rendered. *Poor Law Board, Oct.* 15, 1857.

CONSULTATIONS WHEN NECESSARY TO BE PROCURED BY THE MEDICAL OFFICER AND CHARGED TO THE GUARDIANS.

85. I am directed by the Poor Law Board to inform the Guardians of the Weymouth Union that they have given their consideration to Mr. Griffin's claim to the sum of £2 2s. for the services which he rendered in the case of the poor man named B———, of Nottington. The Board have deemed it proper to communicate with Mr. W——— the Relieving Officer, and they learn from him that his attention was first called to this case by Mr. D———, a Justice of the Peace, who told him that Mr. P———, the Medical Officer who was then attending B———, could do no more for him. That he (Mr. W———) then went to Mr. P——— and informed him that if he considered there was any danger, or that further advice was necessary, he had better send for another medical man. It appears that Mr. P———, acting upon the authority which he had received from the Relieving Officer, then called to his aid Mr. Griffin, intimating to him that the Relieving Officer had pledged himself to remunerate him for his services. On referring to Art. 215, No. 3, of the Consolidated Order of the 24th July, 1847, the Guardians will observe that it is the duty of the Relieving Officer "in any case of sickness or accident, requiring relief by medical attendance, to procure such attendance by giving an order on the District Medical Officer, or such other means as the urgency of the case may require." The Board think that, looking to the duty of the Relieving Officer as prescribed by this Article, it was competent to him to adopt the course which he pursued. The Board, therefore, direct me to inform the Guardians that (without expressing any opinion as to the precise amount of the fee which Mr. Griffin should be paid), they are of opinion that he is entitled to be remunerated for the professional services which, by the authority of the Relieving Officer, acting on behalf of the Guardians, he was called upon to render in this case.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) COURTENAY, Secretary.

January 28, 1857.

PARTURITION.

CHILDBIRTH.—Definition of.

86. The view of the Commissioners is, that whenever pregnancy is so far advanced that it was possible that the child might have been born alive, then the delivery of such a case (though still-born) would entitle the Medical Officer to the usual fee. A seven-months' child might have been born alive, and for this reason the Commissioners think the Medical Officer should be paid the fee. *Jan.* 6, 1844.

MIDWIFERY FEE to PERSONS on the PERMANENT PAUPER LIST.

87. Persons on the list required to be made out by Art. 16, and who shall be in possession of the ticket required to be given by Art. 17, and shall have caused such ticket to be exhibited to the Medical Officer, as provided by Art. 18, are entitled to medical advice, attendance, and medicines; and the Medical Officer so attending would, if the case be one of childbirth, be entitled to be paid the usual midwifery fee.

The order provides that the Medical Officer shall be paid the usual fee for attendance in childbirth in the case of any woman actually receiving relief (or whom the Guardians may decide to have been in a destitute condition), under circumstances of difficulty or danger without any order.

The medical tickets provided for by Arts. 17 and 18 of the General Medical Order are intended to be given only to aged and infirm persons, or persons permanently sick or disabled.

The Commissioners are of opinion that, for attendance on the wife of any pauper in childbirth, a separate order should be given to the Medical Officer. At the same time, if the wife's name is inserted in the medical ticket, and the Medical Officer has attended her in childbirth without any further order, the Commissioners think that, looking to the terms of Art. 18, which provides that the Medical Officer, on the exhibition to him of the ticket, and an application made on behalf of the party to whom the ticket was given, shall be held responsible for affording advice, attendance, and medicine, "in the same manner as if he had received, in each case, a special order," the Medical Officer would be entitled to the payment of a fee for his attendance. *July*, 1845.

MIDWIFERY CASES REQUIRE an ORDER.

88. A Medical Officer is only legally required to attend on paupers, whether for midwifery cases or for cases of illness, when called upon to do so by a written or printed order, given by some person competent to grant relief; and if a Medical Officer's services are not given in accordance to such a requisition, he has no legal right to a fee or other special remuneration from the Guardians, excepting always when attendance has been given on a woman in childbirth, under circumstances of difficulty or danger, who was actually receiving relief, or whom the Guardians may subsequently decide to have been at the time in a destitute condition. *November*, 1849.

MIDWIFERY CASE in the WORKHOUSE.

89. The Commissioners consider the Medical Officer to be entitled to a fee in every case in which he has been sent for by the Master or the Matron of the Workhouse to attend a woman in the Workhouse, either in or immediately after childbirth. *June* 25, 1841.

CHILDBIRTH in the case of a SINGLE WOMAN who refuses to go into the WORKHOUSE.

90. Cases of this kind should be carefully watched by the Relieving Officer, as, if the application for medical relief be renewed, or the Guardians or the Relieving Officer are otherwise aware of the destitution of the applicant at a later period, when she might be in an unfit state to be removed into the Workhouse, it would then become the duty of the Relieving Officer to give an order for the attendance of the Medical Officer at the pauper's lodgings, and this notwithstanding her previous refusal of an order of admission to the Workhouse. The second exception to Art. 1 of the General Prohibitory Order leaves it to the discretion of the Guardians to grant relief out of the Workhouse where a person shall require relief on account of any sickness, &c., affecting such person or any of his family. *March*, 1846.

PAYMENT of MIDWIFERY FEE, where ORDER is given by OVERSEER.—Medical Tickets how far available.

91. Where the Overseer is legally qualified to make the order, that is, in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, the Guardians are bound to pay the fee under Art. 12 of the General Medical Order. But if the Guardians think the Overseer was not legally authorized to give such order, they may decline to pay the fee, and the Overseer will then make the payment himself, and include the same in his accounts, subject to the allowance or disallowance of the item by the Auditor. *October*, 1845.

MIDWIVES.

EMPLOYMENT to ATTEND PAUPERS.

92. The Commissioners, moreover, see no objection to the employment of midwives in cases of ordinary labours, provided that the persons employed in that capacity be competent to discharge properly the duty which they undertake. To ensure this, as far as practicable, they should be selected with care; and the Guardians would do well to ascertain from the Medical Officers of the respective districts whether they are aware of any objection to the particular person proposed to be employed. The Guardians should impress upon the midwives, who may be employed by them, that the Medical Officer is to be called in in all cases of emergency. With respect to the Guardians paying fees to their Surgeons for instructing and qualifying midwives to attend the wives of paupers, the Commissioners are not aware of any provision of the law which will authorize them in saying that such fees can be legally paid out of the poor rates. *May* 8, 1846.

MIDWIVES.

93. As regards the expense of widwives employed to deliver persons in the Workhouse, the Commissioners are of opinion that the cost would be properly placed to the cost of the parish liable for the maintenance of the pauper. *March* 10, 1843.

MEDICAL RECOMMENDATIONS, COMMONLY CALLED "ORDERS."

DUTIES OF GUARDIANS AND RELIEVING OFFICERS IN REGARD TO.

94. The word "ordered," inserted in the last column of the Medical Officer's certificate, is not to be taken as absolutely imperative, either upon the Relieving

Officer or the Guardians, but is to be regarded as a recommendation, expressive of the Medical Officer's sense of what is required; and the certificate is accordingly to be attended to in such a way and to such an extent as the Relieving Officer or the Guardians, on their own responsibility, and on their knowledge of the circumstances of the individual in favour of whom the certificate is given, may deem to be actually necessary. If the word "ordered" in the certificate were to be taken in any other sense than that now pointed out, it would have the effect of constituting the Medical Officer the absolute judge, not only of the kind of relief to be afforded, but also of the capacity of the patient to provide it out of his own resources, without leaving even this latter question to the Guardians, in whom the discretion of giving or withholding relief of every kind is vested by law. Of course it becomes them, in the exercise of this discretion, to be very guarded, and to caution the Relieving Officer also to be on his guard if any case should occur in which, acting on a sense of duty, they may deem it right to disregard either wholly or in part the Medical Officer's certificate, as this would involve a serious responsibility, and could only be justified by a knowledge that the circumstances of the individual were really such as to make the particular relief certified as being necessary by the Medical Officer improper to be given at the cost of the Union. The foregoing observations will, the Board believe, afford a sufficient answer to the question as to the legal powers of the Guardians and the Relieving Officer in the case referred to; and with respect to the last question, the Board consider that if in any instance the Relieving Officer should, from his knowledge of the circumstances of the parties, deem it to be his duty not to carry the directions of the Medical Officer into full effect, he ought, with the least possible delay, to report the same to the Board of Guardians, together with his reasons for so acting, in order that they may decide whether he has exercised a sound discretion in the matter, and give directions accordingly. *March* 22, 1850.

ORDERS OF MEDICAL OFFICER OUGHT TO BE LITERALLY COMPLIED WITH BY THE RELIEVING OFFICER UNTIL NEXT MEETING OF THE GUARDIANS.

95. The Commissioners stated, that the Relieving Officer ought to have complied literally with the recommendation of the Medical Officer until the next meeting of the Board of Guardians, and that he ought not to have substituted other articles at the request of the pauper, though he might have added them at his own discretion. 1841.

RELIEVING OFFICER'S DUTY IN REGARD TO MEDICAL ORDERS.

96. A Medical Officer is not empowered to order, authoritatively, the supply of food or articles of diet to any sick pauper under his care, though he may certify to the Relieving Officer what particular necessaries he considers the pauper to require. The Relieving Officer, on receiving such a certificate, will act upon it as he may deem right. He is directed by the General Consolidated Order, Art. 215, No. 15, in every case of a poor person receiving Medical Relief, to supply, until the next meeting of the Guardians, such relief (not being in money) as the case on his own view, "or on the certificate of the District Medical Officer," may seem to require. The opinion expressed by the Medical Officer in such certificate will be entitled to the greatest weight, both with the Relieving Officer and with the Board of Guardians; and no doubt the Relieving Officer will generally exercise a wise discretion in acting in conformity with it. If in the intervals of the Guardians' meetings, he refuses to furnish the food or other necessaries so recommended by the Medical Officer, he will do so on his own responsibility, and he must be fully prepared to justify the refusal. *June* 22, 1850.

OVERSEER'S DUTY IN CASES OF URGENT NECESSITY.

97. The Overseers are bound, under the provisions of Sec. 54 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, to give, in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, such temporary relief as each case shall require, in articles of absolute necessity, but not in money, and whether the applicant for relief be settled in the parish where he shall apply for relief or not.

If the recommendation of a Medical Officer for articles of food, in a case marked by him as one of sudden and urgent necessity, where taken to an Overseer, he would, to say the least, be fully justified in obeying it; indeed, if the party were destitute, he would be bound to do so. It may be said that he is bound by the Commissioners' Regulations to report the relief afforded to the

Board of Guardians; he is so, but it does not follow that the Guardians have the power of disallowing the cost of it. If they refuse to repay him, it can be charged in his accounts, and it can be disallowed by the Auditor alone. Against this disallowance, moreover (if made), there will be, by Sec. 35 and 36 of 7 and 8 Vic., c. 101, an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench or the Poor Law Commissioners. *November* 28, 1844.

FOR A RELIEVING OFFICER OR A BOARD OF GUARDIANS TO REFUSE TO COMPLY WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF A MEDICAL MAN IS, ON THE PART OF EITHER, TO INCUR A VERY CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY.

98. The benefit of any doubt ought always to be given to the pauper, and in all ordinary cases the nourishment should be furnished at once. Inquiry can be made afterwards.

Now, whether it be desirable to transfer this discretion, in the matter of relief, from the Board of Guardians to the Medical Officer, without any control on the part of the former, the Commissioners do not feel called upon to decide. The Legislature only can authorize such a change. *November* 28, 1844.

MEDICAL ORDERS FOR DIET TO THE POOR.

99. The Uxbridge Board of Guardians resolved that when the Medical Officer order any articles of diet for persons whom they are attending, by direction of the Board, such order signed by the Medical Officer is to be immediately complied with, and the Relieving Officer will explain to the tradespeople of the different parishes, that articles supplied or such orders will be paid for by the Board, until they receive notice from him to discontinue doing so. *November* 28, 1844.

ALLOWANCE OF BEER AND WINE TO THE AGED INMATES OF A WORKHOUSE.

100. The Board consider that the Medical Officer certainly cannot order beer and wine, as extras, to any of the workhouse inmates, whether aged or infirm, or otherwise, merely as comforts. He can only prescribe them as medicines, or as things specifically required for health. If the Medical Officer is of opinion that any persons from extreme age or chronic disease require to have such extras, as those referred to above, the Board would not object to the Medical Officer giving a general direction, quarterly, or for any other convenient period in respect of the particular paupers whom he may name; but if he were enabled to give a general order for the supply of these or any other articles to an entire class of the inmates, such as the aged and infirm, he would have the power of establishing a dietary for the workhouse, and thus supersede both the Board and the Guardians. *August* 21, 1848.

SMOKING IN A WORKHOUSE.

101. By Art. 121, no pauper shall smoke in any room of the workhouse except by the special direction of the Medical Officer. They desire to point out, however, that if the deprivation of smoking tobacco be likely to be injurious to the health of any inmate, it is open to the Medical Officer to direct the use of tobacco in any particular case. But such direction must be entered in the Workhouse Medical Relief Book as an extra allowance, rendered necessary by the state of the pauper's health. *November*, 1851.

APPLIANCES NOT INCLUDED IN MEDICAL CONTRACTS.

102. The Commissioners are of opinion that cotton-wool and calico are not such articles as a medical man would furnish to a private patient. They are not in the terms "medical and surgical appliances" in the General Order of the Commissioners on "duties of Officers," and, therefore, that they should be furnished at the expense of the Union. *May* 6, 1844.

BREAD FOR POULTICES.

103. The Commissioners desire to state that as bread for poultices is not supplied by medical men to private patients, and as in fact a household article, they are of opinion that it does not come within the meaning of the words "medical and surgical appliances," as used in the Medical Order, and that it ought therefore to be supplied by the Relieving Officer. *June* 10, 1844.

LINSEED POULTICES.

104. The Commissioners are disposed to consider that any ingredient kept by druggists, and not forming part of the ordinary consumption of the Workhouse, nor included in the common domestic stores, should, strictly speaking, be

furnished by the Medical Officer; and linseed meal is probably of this description. The Commissioners, however, see no objection to the Guardians providing the meal in question. *June* 11, 1847.

LIABILITY OF MEDICAL OFFICERS TO SUPPLY LEECHES TO MEMBERS OF SICK CLUBS.

105. The Commissioners think that, when the Medical Officer is bound to furnish the medical and surgical appliances, he is bound to furnish leeches, as falling within this description; but the Medical Officer must exercise his own discretion as to the cases in which leeches are requisite; and the Commissioners think that the Medical Officer is not bound to furnish leeches, or any particular surgical appliance, or medicine, in a case which was not regularly under his care. The Commissioners are therefore of opinion that the Medical Officer was justified in his refusal to supply leeches in the case in question. *May*, 1844.

CONVEYANCE OF MEDICINES TO SICK PAUPERS.

106. The General Medical Order issued by the Commissioners does not contain any regulation on the subject referred to; and the Commissioners are of opinion that the Medical Officers are not bound, under the provision of that order, to forward to the residences of the sick paupers under their care the medicines prescribed for them by such Medical Officers. If the paupers are able to go themselves for the medicines, or can send for them by any member of their family, or other available means, they may be reasonably expected to do so. The Commissioners also believe that in general the Medical Officers co-operate in forwarding the medicine to the paupers, in so far as the means of sending medicines in their general practice may be available for the like purpose as regards their pauper patients, without incurring additional expense. But if the paupers themselves are unable to go, or send for the medicine, and if the Medical Officer cannot forward them without employing a special messenger for the purpose, it then becomes the duty of the Relieving Officer, under the direction of the Board of Guardians, to provide for the due conveyance of the medicine to the paupers; as in no case must the latter be left without the medicine prescribed for them by the Medical Officer. The subject is one of detail, depending on local and temporary circumstances, which ought in general to be regulated according to the discretion of the Board of Guardians, when any difficulty arises. *October* 10, 1845.

PROVIDING BOTTLES FOR MEDICINE.

107. Art. 206, No. 1, of the General Consolidated Order of the Poor Law Commissioners, prescribes as part of the duties of the Medical Officer that he shall supply the requisite medicines to his pauper patients. The Board are of opinion that he cannot be held to do this unless he supplies the medicines in such a state as to admit of their being conveyed to the patients; and if the latter are unable to send a bottle or vessel, in which liquid medicine may be put, the providing a bottle for the purpose rests with the Medical Officer, unless there is some special provision on the subject in his contract. The bottles ought, if furnished by the Medical Officer in any case, to be preserved and restored to him by the pauper patients. *Sept.* 22, 1848.

SURGERY NOT TO BE LEFT WITHOUT SOME ONE TO ANSWER APPLICATIONS.

108. The Commissioners think that some one should always be left in charge to give an answer to any person who may apply at the surgery in the absence of the surgeon or his apprentice. *July*, 1842.

MEDICAL OFFICER OF WORKHOUSE ENTITLED TO FEES AT CORONERS' INQUESTS.

109. By the 6 and 7 Wm. 4, c. 89, sec. 5, it is enacted that when any inquest shall be holden on the body of any person who has died in any public Hospital, or Infirmary, or any building, or place belonging thereunto, or used for the reception of the patients thereof, or who has died in any County or other Lunatic Asylum, or in any public Infirmary, or other public medical Institution, whether the same be supported by endowments, or by voluntary subscriptions, then and in such case, nothing herein contained shall be continued to entitle the Medical Officer whose duty it may have been to attend the deceased person as a Medical Officer of such Institution, as aforesaid, to the fees or remuneration herein provided.

The Commissioners do not concur in the construction which would extend the provision to the Medical Officer of a Union Workhouse.

A Union Workhouse does not appear to be a public Hospital, or Infirmary, within the meaning of the statute. It appears probable that, in considering whether a public institution comes within the description of the statute, the general character and object of such institution should be looked at, and not the use which is immediately made of it. By the word "Infirmary" is meant a place established for, and applied to, the reception and medical treatment of persons infirm through sickness, and to such persons only. A Workhouse, on the other hand, is intended for the reception and employment of destitute persons. It is true that persons who are sick, as well as destitute, are admitted, but it is because they are destitute, and not because they are sick. *March*, 1846.

FEE FOR EVIDENCE AT CORONER'S INQUEST IN A WORKHOUSE.

110. Where the Medical Officer's contract does not require him to give evidence at inquests, as one of the duties for the performance of which the salary is the consideration, there is nothing to prevent his receiving the usual fee allowed by the Coroner in such cases. *November* 16, 1841.

A MEDICAL OFFICER NOT ENTITLED TO EXAMINE, ANATOMICALLY, THE BODIES OF PAUPER INMATES OF A WORKHOUSE.

111. The Commissioners stated that nothing further is required by them in their order, directing that the Medical Officer of the Union should "ascertain and certify the cause of death" in the case of a pauper dying in the Workhouse, than a statement of what, from apparent circumstances, and such information as can be obtained from nurses and attendants, may be considered the probable cause of death. In no case do the Commissioners desire a post-mortem examination to take place solely for the purpose of satisfying their rule. Excepting by the direction of a Coroner when holding an inquest, or of the Board of Guardians, for any special, urgent, and peculiar reason, which they may deem of sufficient importance to render such an examination necessary, or at the request of the nearest relatives of the deceased, the Commissioners deem that the Medical Officer would not be justified in making a post-mortem examination. The Commissioners have further to add, that the Board of Guardians would hardly be justified in directing in any particular case that a post-mortem examination should take place, if the nearest relatives of the deceased objected clearly and decidedly to the course; and the Commissioners need hardly add, that the Guardians would, as far as circumstances will permit, do well to satisfy themselves of the necessity for such an examination before they took upon themselves to authorize it. *November* 16, 1841.

ADMISSION OF PERSONS UNDER INFECTIOUS DISEASES INTO WORKHOUSE.

112. If there are the means of separating persons labouring under infectious diseases, without risk to the other inmates of the establishment, the Board think that the master should receive such persons into the house. If, on the other hand, there are no such means of accommodation, and the safety of the inmates would be endangered by the admission, the Board think that the master would not be bound to admit infected persons brought with the order of the Relieving Officer. In any such cases, however, the master should instantly send for the Relieving Officer or Overseer to see that the case is properly attended to, by providing some temporary accommodation or lodging as the urgency of the case may call for. *May* 3, 1848.

MEDICAL ORDERS.

DUTIES OF MEDICAL OFFICER IN RESPECT OF.

113. 1st.—The Relieving Officer is not bound to visit a pauper before giving a medical order, although it is expedient that he should visit, and, indeed, is obligatory upon him to visit such pauper as soon as he can after application for medical relief, unless such application is refused in the first instance. 2nd.—The Board consider it compulsory on the Medical Officer to attend to an order given by a Relieving Officer. 3rd.—The Medical Officer is not legally bound to attend to a medical order given by a Relieving Officer of his (the Medical Officer's) district, except in cases of paupers belonging to townships in the Relieving

Officer's district, but residing in the Medical Officer's district. 4th. A poor person requiring medical relief in a case of urgency should, in the event of the Relieving Officer being from home, call upon the Overseers, who have authority, if the case be urgent, to give a medical order. A Guardian has no such authority. 5th. A Medical Officer is not legally bound to attend a pauper patient, unless the order calling upon him to do so be written or printed, although, probably, he may not think it expedient to insist upon such an order in all cases that may arise. 6th. The Guardians, Overseers, or Relieving Officers, are the only competent parties to say whether a person is to have medical assistance at the expense of the poor rates; consequently, a District Medical Officer has no power to compel the Guardians, or the other officers referred to by you, to grant an order for medical relief under the circumstances stated in your last inquiry. *April*, 1849.

Master and Matron's Duty to send for Medical Officer.

114. Resolved, that in accordance with the advice of the Poor Law Commissioners, the Master and Matron be instructed in future to send a written communication to the Medical Officer, in any dangerous case requiring his immediate attendance; and that the Master be furnished with a printed check-book for the purpose. The Commissioners approve of this resolution. *June* 9, 1843.

Record of Visits in Medical Officers' Books.

115. If an Apprentice or unqualified Assistant has visited or seen the patient, and "attendance" is recorded, it must be distinguished from that given by the Medical Officer himself.

The Medical Officer is bound to visit his patients at their own homes; but whether the patient is seen at his own home, or attends voluntarily at the Medical Officer's house or a station, provided he is seen and examined personally, attendance may be recorded. *Feb.* 8, 1844.

Duty of Medical Officer to Visit the Sick.

116. It is the duty of the Medical Officer to attend paupers in sickness at the earliest practicable time after he shall have been legally required to do so. If, however, he be unavoidably prevented from attending the pauper at once, and being in possession of what he may deem sufficient information as to the nature of the case, he orders some medicine to be taken in the interval previous to his intended visit, the Board think he would act rightly in entering the patient's name in the weekly return, although he may not have seen the pauper at the time of making such entry. The Medical Officer must, of course, be prepared to justify any delay which he may suffer to take place in making his first visit to the sick pauper.

The Board are of opinion that, in any long standing case of sickness, whether the pauper be above or under sixty years of age, the Medical Officer ought not to discontinue his visits so long as the Guardians give the pauper a ticket entitling him to permanent medical relief, as the Medical Officer's attendance is thereby required for the case while the ticket remains in force. *July*, 1850.

Visits of a Medical Officer at the Patient's House.

117. A Medical Officer is bound, if necessary, to visit his patients at their own homes; and if serious inconvenience is caused to any pauper by coming to the Medical Officer, the visits should be made. For the Commissioners to prohibit any attendance, except at the patients' homes, would be unreasonable and unnecessary; but if the Medical Officer refuses or neglects to visit, he must be prepared to show that he was justified in the particular case. *April*, 1844.

Record of Attendance in the Medical Relief Book.

118. The Board would point out that what is required is not a daily, but a weekly signature of his attendance, by the Medical Officer, to each case, with such a mark under each day as will show whether or not the case has been attended on that day.

Conveyance of Medical Returns to the Meetings of the Guardians.

119. The General Consolidated Order of the 24th July, 1847, Art. 206, No. 4, directs, that the District Medical Officer shall make a return to the Guardians at each ordinary meeting in a book prepared according to a form prescribed. As the duty of making these returns devolves upon the Medical Officer, in strictness it rests with him to provide the means for conveying them to and from the place at which the meetings of the Guardians are held. For this reason it appears to the Board that any direction by the Guardians to the Relieving Officer to convey the returns could not be considered as a direction applicable to his office (within Art. 215, No. 6), which he would be bound to obey. Ordinarily, however, the Relieving Officer will incur very little trouble in bringing with him, to the weekly meetings of the Guardians, the returns of the Medical Officers. It appears that, hitherto, it has been the practice of the Relieving Officer to assist in this matter, which has not only been a convenience to the Medical Officers, but has also been attended by the advantage of insuring regularity in the delivery of the returns. The Board can only say, that it seems to be so reasonable that the Relieving Officers should continue to render this assistance, that the Board can scarcely anticipate that they would decline to do so without any sufficient cause. *March* 26, 1857.

Penalty for Illegal Removal of Paupers.

120. By the fourth clause of 9 and 10 Vic. c. 66, the power of removing paupers, in cases where the relief is made necessary by sickness or accident, is taken away, unless the Justices granting the warrant state in such warrant that they are satisfied that the sickness or accident will produce permanent disability.

The object of the clause is to prevent removals in cases of temporary sickness or accident. It will materially interfere, therefore, with the granting of suspended orders of removal; and will, consequently, remove the inducement for the allowance of non-resident relief in many such cases as those which have heretofore occurred. The paupers will have to be maintained by the parish where they are sick.

This provision will, probably, be found to have some bearing upon those cases of considerable practical difficulty, which arise in the relief of casualties, and the charging of the cost of such relief.

The Commissioners deem it right to call the attention of the Guardians to the 6th sec., which provides, that "if any officer of any parish or union do, contrary to law, with intent to cause any poor person to become chargeable to any parish to which such person was not then chargeable, convey any poor person out of the parish for which such officer acts, or cause or procure any poor person to be so conveyed, or give directly or indirectly any money, relief, or assistance, or afford or procure to be afforded any facility for such conveyance, or make any offer or promise, or use any threat to induce any poor person to depart from such parish; and if in consequence of such conveyance or departure, any poor person become chargeable to any parish to which he was not then chargeable, such officer, on conviction thereof before any two Justices, shall forfeit and pay, for every such offence, any sum not exceeding five pounds, nor less than forty shillings." *September* 17, 1846.

Rupture not in a general way considered a Permanent Disability.

121. A rupture, in itself, cannot be said to create a permanent disability, though doubtless in some cases it may do so. If it does not prevent a person from working, or gaining his own livelihood, the Board conceive that it would not create a permanent disability within the meaning of the 9 and 10 Vic., c. 66, sec. 4. *January*, 1849.

Childbirth not a Sickness.

122. With regard to pregnancy, the Board apprehend that it will not of itself constitute a sickness of the kind contemplated by 9 and 10 Vic., c. 66, sec. 4, as likely to produce permanent disability; but it may be accompanied by such ailments as would constitute temporary sickness within the meaning of the clause. If the woman in such a case receives relief, she will be irremovable; but if the pregnancy, without being accompanied by ailments amounting to sickness, simply produces destitution (as by incapacitating the woman from her

ordinary work), and she receives relief in consequence of that destitution, she will not be rendered irremovable under the section referred to. Childbirth, in ordinary cases, will be a temporary sickness within the enactment. *December* 27, 1850.

MEDICAL RELIEF SUFFICIENT TO AUTHORIZE REMOVAL.

123. Medical relief only afforded to an applicant for such relief, and for that alone, is such a constructive chargeability as may authorize Justices to grant orders of removal. *March*, 1843.

CASE PAYMENTS, A CHARGE ON THE RESPECTIVE PARISHES.

124. The payments per case to Medical Union Officers, being clearly relief to the particular paupers, should be charged to the respective parishes on whose account it is given, in the same way as ordinary relief to the paupers would be charged. 1848.

ARRANGEMENTS RESPECTING MEDICAL RELIEF IN THE WAYLAND UNION.

125. That the Relieving Officers, at the commencement of each year, shall severally prepare a list of all persons in receipt of permanent relief resident in each medical district, and shall deliver such list as soon as prepared to the Medical Officer of such district; and shall, further, from time to time give notice to the Medical Officer of any alterations which may take place in such list, and that all persons whose names shall be upon such list for the time being, shall be attended in case of sickness by the Medical Officer of the district in which they shall be resident, in consideration of the fixed salary, without special order.

That no other person shall receive medical relief, except by order of the Board of Guardians, or of some officer or other person duly authorized by law to order the same to be given.

In all cases in which such order shall be given by any Officer of the Union or Parish Officer, the same must be reported to the Board of Guardians at their next weekly meeting, as in all other cases of provisional relief, or the person giving the same will be held to be individually liable for the payment.

If such order shall be then confirmed by the Board, the Medical Officer shall receive, for his attendance on the same, the sum of seven shillings and sixpence, which sum shall be considered due, and be payable at the close of the quarter in which the sickness shall have commenced.

If, however, the Board shall not think fit to confirm any provisional order for medical relief, which shall have been duly reported by the person giving the same, the clerk shall forthwith give notice thereof to the Medical Officer, who shall in that case be entitled to 2s. 6d. for his past attendance, provided the case shall appear in the weekly return of cases previously to such notice, but not otherwise.

That no case of relapse shall be considered as a separate case for payment, unless the case shall have been reported as cured, or as not having again been seen or applied to be seen by the Medical Officer, and shall continue well, or make no fresh application for the space of three weeks from the date of such report.

That the salaries and payments above-mentioned shall include all journeys, medicines, and appliances whatever, except trusses, which shall be provided when necessary by the Medical Officer, and charged to the Union at cost price.

That the Medical Officer shall, as at present, attend any person belonging to any Parish in the Union, and resident within one mile of the limits thereof, on the same terms as if such persons were resident within such limits.

That all certificates which may be required by the Board of Guardians shall be given without fee, except where the Medical Officer may be required to visit any person at his or her own residence for that purpose, in which case, if no further order be made thereon, he shall be entitled to the same fee as if such person were attended under a provisional order.

That the Medical Officer of the Workhouse be required to give his attendance there at least three times in every week at such intervals, that not more than two whole days shall elapse between any two visits; or if, from any unavoidable cause, a greater interval shall so elapse, the same must be regularly reported by him to the Board at its next weekly meeting.

Resolved—that, subject to the approbation of the Poor Law Commissioners, from and after the 25th March, 1841, the Medical Officers be remunerated partly by a fixed salary, of which the amount shall have reference to the number of persons in receipt of permanent relief, and partly by a payment per case, at an uniform rate. The fixed salaries (including that for the Workhouse), to be, as at present, an establishment charge, and apportioned as such; the cases to be charged to the Parish to which the pauper belongs, if belonging to any Parish in the Union, or receiving relief from this Board, on behalf of any other Board of Guardians, or under suspended orders of removal; otherwise to the Parish in which such pauper shall be resident, as in other cases of persons casually chargeable. *November* 20, 1844.

VACCINATION.

CHARGE FOR VACCINATION OF CHILDREN IN WORKHOUSE BY THE WORKHOUSE MEDICAL OFFICER.

126. As by Art. 78, No. 5, of the General Workhouse Rules, it is made the duty of the Medical Officer of the Workhouse to vaccinate such of the children in the Workhouse as may require vaccination, in the absence of any express contract providing for a specific payment to the Medical Officer for vaccination in the Workhouse, he cannot claim payment from the Guardians under his general vaccination contract for the vaccination of such children, inasmuch as, when he vaccinated them, he was acting in his character of Medical Officer, and not in that of public vaccinator. *April* 17, 1847.

VACCINATION NOT TO BE DEEMED RELIEF.

127. The statute 3 and 4 Vic. c. 29, does not confine the contracts for vaccination to persons in receipt of relief from the poor rates, and the statute 4 and 5 Vic. c. 32, expressly enacts that vaccination is not to be deemed relief, the object of the Legislature being to promote vaccination generally. As the contract, which the Guardians are required to make for vaccination, under the 3 and 4 Vic. c. 29, is for the vaccination "of all persons resident in the Union," it is certainly open to any persons therein, whether in the condition of paupers or otherwise, to apply to the public vaccinator. The Board presume that the Guardians of the Wem Union have adopted the form of contract for vaccination generally used in Unions, which provides that payments shall be made only for successful cases. If every case be properly attended to, there ought not to arise any question as to the vaccinator's duty in the event of any child being brought to him a second time for vaccination. But the Board apprehend that, if the operation has not been in the first instance successful, the vaccinator should again vaccinate the child. *August* 24, 1849.

RIGHT OF GUARDIANS TO ORDER VACCINATION WITHOUT CONSENT OF PARENTS.

128. The Poor Law Commissioners are of opinion that the Guardians have, without the permission of the parent, the right to vaccinate any child in their custody, during any danger of contagion from the small-pox.

There can be no doubt that the Guardians are bound to prevent contagion, by keeping those who are labouring under contagious diseases from coming into contact with others who might contract the disease. Exposure in a public place, of children having the small-pox, is an indictable offence, and exposure to the inmates in a Workhouse, the proper place for the reception of all destitute persons, would not seem to be essentially distinguishable from exposure in a public place.

When the disease has once appeared in a Workhouse, it is not safe to send out the inmates in which it may not have showed itself, but in whom it may be latent.

On the other hand, the Guardians are bound to protect all the inmates who may yet be protected from the danger, and the Commissioners see no limit to the medical, surgical, or other sanatory means which the Guardians may, and are bound to employ, provided the means are such as competent judges would hold to be proper.

Thus, for more ordinary purposes of cleanliness, there is no question that the Guardians rightly exercise, without express permission from the parent, a constraint on the persons of the paupers, which if exercised by a stranger would amount to assault.

Again, as to medical treatment, this is often very painful, is rarely pleasant, and can scarcely be afforded to the younger paupers without frequent instances of constraint. But there seems to be no reason to doubt that the Guardians would grossly neglect their duty to the patient, if they waited for a parent's permission to administer medicine; and every medicine operates so far like vaccination, as it expels one disorder by the introduction of another of a less violent or dangerous character.

Then as to surgical treatment, there can be as little doubt that the bleeding or other operations involving more personal violence, are as justifiable in the cases in which they can be beneficially applied, as less violent sanatory precautions.

In-as-far then as the puncturing of the skin and the introduction of vaccine is a mere precaution against an apprehended disease, not a remedy for an existing disease, this would appear to constitute no essential distinction from the preceding cases, even if in other cases the medical and surgical care was never applied but when disorder had actually made its appearance. For, even in these cases, medical and surgical treatment is as much directed to the prevention or alleviation of the apprehended progress of a disorder, as to the cure or alleviation of the disease at its present stage.

It seems to the Commissioners, therefore, that whenever medical men are agreed that any application is the specific or most proper prevention of any disorder immediately apprehended, the Guardians are fully justified in law in applying it; and more especially when the bad consequences of neglect would extend beyond the pauper to whom the application is proposed to be made; and that the fact that the consent of parents or of the pauper is wanting, that the appliance involves personal violence and the introduction of a specific disease, and that it is purely and exclusively precautionary, as in the case of vaccination when the small-pox is known to be prevalent, makes no difference in the duty and right of the Guardians in these respects. *May* 18, 1840.

Vaccinators.—Their Qualifications.

129. The 3 and 4 Vic. cap. 29, requires that the Guardians should contract with a Medical Officer of the Union, or a legally qualified Medical Practitioner. The Poor Law Commissioners have prescribed the qualifications for the Medical Officer of the Union; but have not professed to define the precise meaning of the terms "legally qualified Medical Practitioner." They certainly do not consider that the person to be appointed as a vaccinator need be qualified in the same manner as the Medical Officer of the Union. If vaccination be a surgical operation, any Practitioner who is legally qualified to practice surgery, may be contracted with by the Guardians, under the statute. If it be a medical operation, falling within the office of an Apothecary, the party must be qualified to practice as an Apothecary, in his general practice. This is the view taken by the Poor Law Board on this subject. *February* 22, 1848.

Withholding Relief to the Parents of Children Unvaccinated, Illegal.

130. The Guardians would not be justified in withholding relief from paupers on this ground, inasmuch as to constitute a valid claim for relief and an obligation on the authorities to grant all necessary relief, it is only required that the party applying be destitute and resident within the Union, or casually destitute therein. The Commissioners think that as so few persons have been vaccinated in the

Union during the past year, as compared with the number of births, it would be advisable for the Guardians to direct the vaccinators, as opportunities may offer to them, to visit the houses of the humbler classes, where they know there are unvaccinated children, and endeavour to obtain the consent of the parents of such children to their being vaccinated. *March* 7, 1845.

Re-vaccination, if Successful, to be Paid for.

131. The Board having regard to the object of the contracts, and of the Act of Parliament under which they were framed, namely, the "Prevention of Small-Pox," the Board consider that it will not be expedient to refuse the fee on re-vaccination in cases where the Guardians may be satisfied that the re-vaccination has really taken place, and has been successful. *December* 23, 1851.

LUNACY.

Visitation of Lunatic Paupers by Medical Officers.

132. The Board have communicated with the Commissioners in Lunacy with a view to ascertain their opinion as to the construction of the enactment in question upon this point; and the Board learn that the Commissioners are of opinion that it was the intention of the Legislature, in that enactment, that the pauper lunatics who may be inmates of Workhouses, should be visited and reported upon quarterly; and that the proper officers to perform this duty are the Medical Officers of the respective Workhouses. You will observe, however, that no fee is provided by the Act to be paid in respect of pauper lunatics in Workhouses, and the Commissioners in Lunacy are of opinion, that the Legislature made this exception advisedly, it being considered that no such fee was called for in the case of a Medical Officer of a Workhouse, which he would in the ordinary course of his duty constantly visit. *October* 26, 1853.

Fee to Medical Practitioners for Certificates in regard to Lunatic Paupers.

133. The Board are not aware of any rule of law which makes any difference as to the right of a Medical Practitioner, called in to examine a poor person alleged to be lunatic, to be paid a proper compensation for his services, whatever may be the result of that examination. *May* 11, 1850.

Visitation of Lunatic Paupers by Medical Officers.

134. 1st.—The duty of a Medical Officer, as to visiting and reporting, under the 16 and 17 Vic., c. 97, sec. 66, applies only to pauper lunatics. By the term "pauper lunatic," is meant every person of unsound mind, and every person being an idiot, who is maintained by, or chargeable to, any parish, union, or county. 2nd.—The Board think that patients who have been discharged from an asylum, as cured, are not to be visited and returned, unless, being chargeable, there is reason also to believe that they are still labouring under such an unsoundness of mind, as is contemplated by the Interpretation Clause, section 132. 3rd.—Idiots, whether adults or children, are to be included in the quarterly return, made by the Medical Officer, under section 66. *December* 19, 1853.

Duty of Medical Officer to Visit Quarterly Pauper Lunatics.

135. It is required that the Medical Officer shall give notice to the Overseer of every lunatic person, of whose lunacy he shall have knowledge, so that steps may be taken to procure his removal to an asylum. If the lunatic be so removed, no necessity will exist for the Medical Officer's visiting; but if, notwithstanding he has given such notice, the lunatic from any cause be not removed, it will be his duty to visit such lunatic, in the manner prescribed in the statute. The Commissioners being aware that there are many pauper lunatics not in any asylum, or licensed house, have deemed it advisable to point out to the Medical Officers of Unions the new duties applicable to them in reference to such lunatics. Upon the provision in the statute, which prohibits the Medical Officer of the Union from giving the requisite certificate of the insanity of the pauper, the Commissioners have only to observe that the Legislature has deemed it right to make this exclusion, and so far as the prohibition extends in the Act, it must be submitted to. *November* 10, 1845.

Duty of Medical Officer to give Notice to Overseer of every Lunatic of whose Lunacy he shall have knowledge.

136. The terms of the section are, "That *every* pauper lunatic, *chargeable to any parish*, who shall not be in an asylum, &c., shall be visited once in every three months by *the Medical Officer of the parish or union to which such lunatic shall belong.*" The Commissioners think it clear that this provision casts upon you, as Medical Officer, the duty of visiting *every* pauper lunatic who "belongs" to any parish within your district. It is provided in the Interpretation Clause (section 84) that the word "lunatic" shall mean every insane person, and every person being an idiot or lunatic, or of unsound mind. The question then arises, what meaning is to be attached to the word "belong," as used in the sentence above cited. The Commissioners have had occasion to communicate on this subject with the Commissioners in Lunacy, who state their views in the following terms: "The Commissioners in Lunacy apprehend that the word 'belong' will be satisfied by holding, for the purpose of that the Medical Officer of the Union within which the pauper resides, and through the Relieving Officer of which, as the Commissioners assume, the weekly payments are made, is the proper Medical Officer to visit the pauper." As the duties imposed by the 55th section are cast upon you as Medical Officer by the statute, which makes no provision for any special payment on that account, the Commissioners think that you are not entitled to any separate fee for the performance of this particular service; but as this additional labour was not contemplated when your appointment took place, it may be a matter for consideration by the Guardians, whether they will deem it right to recommend any increase in your remuneration. *Nov.* 10, 1845.

Relieving Officer, Guardian, or Overseer, to give Notice to Medical Officer of Lunatics.

137. 1st.—The Relieving Officer, or the Guardians, or the Overseers, will doubtless give you the information as to the pauper lunatics who are residing in your district. 2nd.—No time is specified in the Act for making the return; it must be made within every three months; and, consequently, it would seem most convenient that the return should be made at the end of each three months. 3rd.—The Commissioners are not prepared to give any general instruction as to the meaning of the words "fit to be at large," as it is incumbent upon the Medical Officer to make any specific report upon each particular case. But they observe, that the Legislature appears to have contemplated that other than *harmless idiots* may be fit to be at large, as the term actually used is *lunatics*, which includes, according to the Interpretation Clause, *insane persons, and persons of unsound mind*, as well as *idiots*. 4th.—In regard to the lunatic pauper in the Workhouse, it appears that so far as the Medical Officer is concerned, he must give notice, in writing, under section 48, to the Relieving Officer of the Union, in which the parish to which the pauper is chargeable is comprised; and this Relieving Officer must take the requisite proceedings under the statutes. It is manifest, therefore, that no entry in the Form C, nor any notice to the Master, will be a compliance with this provision. 5th.—The Commissioners consider that you cannot certify as to the insanity of any lunatic paupers, who are taken before the Justices, whether they belong to your own district, or any other district in the Union, such paupers not being wandering lunatics. 6th.—It does not appear that there is any restriction upon your certifying as to the insanity of any wandering lunatic brought before the Justices, under the 49th section. *October*, 1845.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Honorary Contributors not recorded in any Union.

	s.	d.
Turner, William, Kensington	100	0
Brown, F. C., M.D., Chatham	62	0
Propert, John, New Cavendish Street	20	0
Smith, William, M.D., Weymouth	21	0
Thornton, Robert, 9th Regiment	21	0
Toynbee, Joseph, Savile Row	21	0
Cotton, C., M.D., Lynn	10	0
Ogle, W., M.D., Lower Belgrave Street	5	0
Hearne, Dr., Southampton	10	0
"Sperans"	5	0
Skinner, W. A., Kings Cliffe	5	0
Students, St. Thomas's Hospital	57	0
Students, Bristol Infirmary	30	0
Bank Interest	55	9

Poor Law Medical Officers.

BEDFORDSHIRE.

Ampthill.

	s.	d.
Chapman ...	10	0

a Bedford.

Veasey	10	0
Gregory ...	5	0
Barker	21	0
Steadman ...	10	0
Wotton, Godfrey, Godfrey, Robinson, Barker, Gregory, Steadman, Prior	40	0

Biggleswade.

Stevens	21	0

Leighton Buzzard.

1 Officer		

a Luton.

Benson	5	0
Tomson	5	0
Farr	5	0
Farr, F.	5	0
Stevens	5	0

a Woburn.

Veasey	10	0
Williams ...	5	0

BERKSHIRE.

a Abingdon.

Martin	41	0
Stone	20	0
Barrett	20	0

a Bradfield.

Kidgell	20	0
Fox	20	0
Smith	10	0
Waldron ...	10	0
Izod	10	0
Breach	10	0

Cookham.

Plumbe	21	0
Westell	10	0
Wilkinson, Robson	10	0
Bellis, Plumbe	20	0

a Easthampstead.

Croft	5	0
Davies	10	0
Thompson ...	5	0

Farringdon.

Maskelyne ...	5	0
Kennard ...	5	0

Hungerford.

Brown	5	0

a Newbury.

Watts	10	0
Watts	10	0

a Reading.

Vines	5	0
Walford ...	10	0
Workman ...	15	0
For several Unions after deducting expenses ...	70	0

a Wallingford.

Breach	15	0
Byass	10	0
Subscribed in Reading		

Wantage.

Lightfoot ...	20	0
Duncan	5	0

a Windsor.

Brown	10	0

a Wokingham.

Luce	26	0
Weight	25	0
Taylor	10	0
May	10	0

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

a Amersham.

Brickwell ...	25	0
Dewsnap ...	5	0
Gray	25	0
Oliver	20	0
Smeathman ...	22	6
Smith	2	6
Officers	25	0
Ditto	25	0
Ditto	27	6
Ditto	27	6

Aylesbury.

Brown	15	0
Hooper	10	0
Cornish	5	0
Ceely	20	0

The Unions marked "*a*" Petitioned the Legislature or Memorialized the Poor Law Board in 1856 or 1857.
The Names marked "*b*" are either Honorary Subscribers, or have ceased to be Poor Law Medical Officers.
Those Names marked "*c*" have subscribed in other Unions, of which they are also Medical Officers.