

at certain prices to the students. Subjects for dissection are scarce, the students are numerous, and each is desirous of getting as much scientific knowledge in return for his outlay as possible. Complaints have been known to have been made by sorrowing relatives who have permitted in the interests of science and for a consideration the remains of their departed to be examined. Such complaints are however, but rare, and in the vast majority of cases the subjects for dissection are of no interest or value to any person outside the institution.

This Bill, which stands for second reading on Tuesday next, is taken from the English Act, 2 and 3, William IV., chap. 75, passed in the year 1832. The word anatomy is confined to anatomy of the human dead body only, and therefore does not in any way sanction the practice of the vivisection of animals. It provides that the Governor may authorize the establishment of Schools of Anatomy, and grant licences to practise to medical men, Professors, teachers, and students on their application, providing such persons are fit to be licensed. He may appoint also Inspectors; he may make rules and regulations and orders. This power is also confided to the governing authorities of the school or schools when authorized and established. Power is given to executors or anybody who has the lawful possession of a deceased person's body to permit an anatomical examination to be made of the body, unless the deceased has in his lifetime expressed his disinclination to be so examined. This provision does not extend to undertakers, who only have possession for purpose of interment. By section 9 any person, if in the interests of science or otherwise he desires to be cut up after death, may so direct in writing, attested by at least two witnesses, and may designate the particular operator. The above are the sources and the only recognised sources for the supply of subjects for dissection.

It is creditable to the promoters of the Bill that they have introduced a clause, which they have not copied from the English Act, to the effect that the dissection of bodies shall be conducted in an orderly, quiet, and decent manner, and without any unnecessary mutilation. This statutory recommendation, though somewhat indefinite, is similar to the rule inculcated in the existing Schools of Anatomy. In spite of this rule, however, our Schools of Anatomy are too often such as our novelists and magazine writers have described them to be, and it will be too much to expect that by virtue of the statutory

injunction our South Australian dissecting-room will be superior in decency to or more elevated in tone than its older rivals. Much may be urged by some that the establishment of a School of Anatomy here is not a thing to be regarded in every respect with satisfaction; but, on the whole, it will occur to the parents of young men who aspire to enter one of the noblest of professions that it is safer for them to be steered through the first two years of their medical course within a stone's throw of the domestic hearth than to be plunged at too early an age into the temptations of distant, larger, and more vicious capitals, far removed from the restraining influences of home and friends.

*Legislative Council
Advertiser Sep 17/84*

ANATOMY BILL.

Second reading.

The MINISTER of JUSTICE and EDUCATION (Hon. R. C. Baker) in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that if they were to establish medical schools here and were to teach young students the anatomy of the human frame, it was absolutely necessary to have a Bill of this kind. The gentlemen who had drawn up the Bill were two members of the University—the Chief Justice and Dr. Stirling—and they gone into the matter very carefully. They had been guided to a great extent by the English Act which had been founded upon the experience of many years. The Act he referred to was 2 and 3 of William IV., chap. 75. The only alteration was to be found in clause 14, which provided that persons practising anatomy were to do so in a tolerably decent manner. This was provided for in England by regulations made by the hospital authorities, but the Government here had considered it desirable to embody them in this Bill, which had been rendered necessary owing to the generosity of one of the leading citizens of South Australia in founding a school of medicine in connection with the University. The Bill, in order to enable that object being carried out, provided for the establishment of schools of anatomy. It provided that licences should be issued for the practice of anatomy, and that inspectors should be appointed to see that the provisions of the Bill were carried out. The only clause on which there might be any difference of opinion was a clause which was not now in the Bill, but which he proposed to insert in committee. The gentlemen who drafted the Bill inserted a clause by which it was provided that all persons who died in public institutions—a number of which were defined in clause 2—should be handed over to the students of practical anatomy, unless those persons previously signified their disinclination to be dissected, or unless their relatives objected on their behalf. It had, however, been pointed out to him that this would tend to undermine the confidence of the public in such institutions as the hospitals. He would read a report which he had received on this point. It was as follows:—"This clause appears to me highly objectionable. If the medical officer of a hospital has a license to cut up the body of any person who dies in the hospital, and has not actively objected while alive, and whose friends being at a distance, do not actively object when he is dead, it will tend to destroy confidence in our public institutions. People will suspect that the objection of the patient has been concealed or set aside, or that the danger of death has been kept from him to prevent his objecting, and even that he has been allowed to die so that his body may be dissected. Dissecting easily becomes a mania and these suspicions or the like are common where there is much dissecting." These reasons seemed to be so forcible that the Government decided to strike out the clause from the Bill, but on reconsidering the matter and discussing it with those gentlemen who would have the practical control of the medical school it was felt they had gone too far and that although the objection might apply to hospitals it would not apply to goals. Therefore in committee he would ask the Council to omit hospitals from the clause. Of course it would be wrong to destroy public confidence in the hospitals, but the more they induced people to keep out of goals the better it would be, and therefore the objection would not apply in respect to goals and destitute asylums. If they did not insert some such provision the Bill would be a dead-letter, because the students would have no one upon whom to practise. The whole Bill was in force in Victoria and no objection had been taken to it, but he thought there was an objection so far as hospitals were concerned, but there could be no objection to the goals and destitute asylums being included. He would move