

Universities and Colleges

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

The following candidates have been approved at the examination indicated :

THIRD M.B., B.S.—J. B. Walter (with honours and distinguished in pathology),
Patience C. Agate, F. Alberts, P. Alwyn-Smith, J. L. Anderson, R. P. Aronson,
W. W. Bardiger, A. G. Bearn, D. L. Bennett, P. Blackledge, A. R. Blowers,
K. W. Bolt, D. F. V. Brunsdon, Barbara Burdett, C. B. Burdett-Smith, Olive N.
Bywaters, G. B. Chamberlain, D. J. Charley, J. F. Cleobury, M. W. Clough-
Ormiston, P. Coling, H. R. Colquitt, Phyllis M. E. Cook, L. Cudkovic, H. D.
Dale, Vera M. Dalley, P. W. Darby, H. J. P. Davies, D. A. Dawson,
D. J. Dennison, Phyllis M. De Saram, A. L. de Silva, J. R. Dickson, A. J. Dinn,
A. E. Doyle, G. Dutton, J. H. O. Earle, D. R. Edwards, T. H. Elias, W. E. D.
Evans, Mary E. G. Feetham, T. R. L. Finnegan, Elspeth M. Frith, O. Garrud,
H. S. Gavourin, J. S. E. Gilbert, Norah E. Gilchrist, A. A. Glynn, Marjorie
Golomb, F. S. Gorrill, R. H. Gorrill, R. V. H. Goulder, D. S. M. Graham,
L. M. Green, D. L. Griffiths, D. D. Hamlyn, Joyce Hanscomb, R. J. Hart,
Dorothy A. Harvey, G. C. Haywood, A. G. Hesling, R. C. Hill, J. H. Hobson,
H. Hofstadter, C. Hougie, G. F. Houston, J. A. Huckbody, K. Hugh-Jones,
R. A. Hunter, J. G. P. Hutchison, D. H. Isaac, F. L. Jackson, Ruth Jackson,
J. G. H. James, A. M. Johnson, C. L. Joiner, P. H. A. Jonason, D. E. E. Jones,
K. L. Jones, N. P. Kalra, D. McK. Kerslake, R. H. N. Lake, T. D. Lambert,
J. D. O'D. Lavertine, K. Lawrence, P. A. W. Lea, I. Levene, J. W. Lewis, S. Lockett,
R. H. Lovell, Grace M. Lukose, A. MacL. Macarthur, Janet G. S. McDowall,
J. Marks, J. W. B. Matthews, A. J. Merry, J. B. Mitchell, Mary Montgomery
Campbell, O. D. Morris, L. E. Mount, A. H. G. Murley, N. G. Nicholson,
D. P. North, J. R. Odell, R. Owen, D. J. Paddison, R. A. Parker, J. Parkyn,
N. L. Paros, Hilary C. Parton, B. K. Patel, C. M. G. Pearson, Phyllis H. Phipps,
A. G. Pollen, R. D. Popham, Helena M. Reckless, Rosemary J. Reynolds, T. N.
Reynolds, Stella M. Ring, A. P. Roberts, J. C. Rogers, Mary A. Russell, L. S.
Sacker, D. E. Savage, P. W. Shepherd, W. J. L. Sladen, B. J. D. Smith, W. R. R.
Thursfield, D. A. H. Tryhall, Florence M. Veall, J. I. Wand-Tetley, H. de B.
Warren, M. D. Warren, D. A. Watson, R. D. Watson, B. W. Webb, W. R. Welply,
E. E. D. S. Wilkinson, A. A. Williams, Jean M. Wilson, W. H. D. Wince, Sophie
P. J. Wright.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF LONDON

At a special meeting of the Royal College of Physicians of London held on May 16, with the President, Lord Moran, in the chair, the following resolutions on the National Health Service Bill were passed :

1. The College acknowledges the urgent necessity for reorganization of the hospital service and approves the principles of the relevant proposals in the National Health Service Bill.
2. Much will depend on the Regional Boards, and the College agrees that the appointment of their members should be determined entirely by their personal fitness for the work.
3. To foster local interest and to encourage initiative the College believes that it is essential to allow hospitals as much independence in administration as is compatible with the regional plan, and for the same reasons it considers that in the case of endowments due account should be taken of the wishes of the donors.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND

Gift from Australia

The letter printed below enclosing a gift of £1,000 has been received by the President of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, Sir Alfred Webb-Johnson, from the President of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, Mr. H. R. G. Poate. This gift is in addition to a donation from the Fellows of the Royal Australasian College resident in New Zealand, and, with the individual contributions of surgeons in the two Dominions, brings the sum given by surgeons in Australia and New Zealand towards the restoration of the Royal College of Surgeons of England to £2,300. This evidence of the loyalty of Fellows of the English College resident at such a distance, and of the attachment of the Fellows of the Australasian College, will be a great encouragement and inspiration to the Council in its efforts to make the Royal College in Lincoln's Inn Fields a still more worthy headquarters of British surgery. Its endeavour will always be to provide full facilities for postgraduate study and research in the scientific departments and the unique museum, which have an imperial value and significance. The letter is dated April 30, 1946, and reads :

Dear Mr. President,

It gives me the very greatest pleasure to forward you the enclosed draft for £1,000 sterling, which represents a gift from members of the Council and Fellows of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons resident in Australia, towards the cost of rebuilding the Royal College of Surgeons of England. In forwarding this amount, may I say that we all consider it a great privilege to have the opportunity of contributing our mite towards the restoration of the seat of learning to which we owe so much.

We in Australia cannot and never will forget what we owe to the Royal College of Surgeons of England, which has done so much towards raising the standard of surgery throughout the British Empire. I would like also to add that this feeling of Australian surgeons towards the Royal College of Surgeons of England only typifies the feeling which the Australian people generally have for the people of England, who have done so much and suffered so much throughout the present war.

We trust that in the very near future that great seat of learning at Lincoln's Inn Fields will again be restored, and so provide the facilities which we, as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, have looked to in the years gone by.

At a meeting of the Royal Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, with Mr. William A. Sewell, President, in the chair, J. D. P. Graham, M.D., was admitted a Fellow of Faculty *qua* Physician.

Medical Notes in Parliament

HEALTH SERVICE BILL

The Standing Committee of the House of Commons resumed on May 15 consideration of the National Health Service Bill, Mr. BOWLES being in the chair. The first day's proceedings were reported in the *Journal* last week (p. 779).

Continuing with Clause 2, which deals with the Central Health Services Council and Standing Advisory Committees, Mr. WILLINK moved to omit the provision that each committee should be set up for the purpose of advising the Minister as well as the Central Council. He wished to be assured that when the Minister received the advice of Standing Advisory Committees that advice would also be made known to the Central Council. It was desirable that the Council should always know what a committee dealing with one particular side of the service was advising the Minister. Mr. BEVAN said he could give Mr. Willink the assurance he wanted. There was no danger of divergent activities. Though in urgent circumstances the Minister might have to act on the advice of a Standing Committee, nevertheless that report would be made known to the Central Council and would form part of the Central Council's annual report. Mr. Willink withdrew his amendment.

WITHHOLDING THE COUNCIL'S REPORT

Mr. MESSER moved an amendment dealing with the provision that the Minister may refrain from laying before Parliament a report, or part of an annual report, from the Central Council if he thought that to do so would be contrary to the public interest. Parliament should know the circumstances of public interest which would make it necessary to refrain from laying such a report. Mr. BEVAN replied that there were few instances in existing legislation where an advisory council had the right, such as this Advisory Council would have, to publish its reports independently of the Minister. At the same time the Minister must be responsible for the report and should be empowered to prevent publication of matters not in the public interest. If the Minister for any unworthy reason—for example, not to cause himself embarrassment—suppressed any part of the report there would be several ways in which these matters could be raised.

Mr. HOPKIN MORRIS said that when a matter came under the Official Secrets Act the Minister was already covered. In the Bill the Minister was given wider powers than in the Official Secrets Act. Sir HUGH LUCAS-TOOTH said that if the report were confidential members of the Council would be precluded from approaching their M.P.s on the subject and the matter could not be raised in the House because no Member could be properly in possession of the information. Mr. BEVAN said he could not accept the amendment because it would overrule the Official Secrets Act. He remarked that where an individual, even a civil servant, took the view that there was a conflict between what he considered the public interest and the obligation he had entered into, he could take the responsibility on himself of making disclosures. The House of Commons had often been made aware of things which individuals thought should be disclosed in the public interest. Sir HENRY MORRIS-JONES felt that the amendment would tie the Minister's hands in certain circumstances.

Dr. CLITHEROW asked whether reports liable to be withheld included reports of medical research. Mr. BEVAN: They might indeed. Dr. CLITHEROW then asked if it was not in the public interest that medical researches should not be disclosed until they had been absolutely covered in every direction. He was thinking of the sulphonamide preparations and those used in gonorrhoea. Owing to the early broadcast of this information the treatment had resulted in making the disease more permanent rather than in cures.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. RICHARD LAW moved that the Minister would only withhold a report, or part of a report, after consultation with the Central Council. Parliament was setting up a vast compre-