

Q. Demanding what?—A. A Wasserman test. I think you can rule that out of reckoning, because people are not going to have their blood taken away before marriage until there has been a tremendous lot of education. This law in Wisconsin does not demand a Wasserman test and yet they have had such beneficial results from it that it shows in practical affairs it is wise to introduce legislation that is a gesture in the right direction, and then slowly make the legislation more effective when the people are educated and ready for it.

The legislation in Wisconsin is this,—that all men applicants for marriage, within fifteen days prior to their application, must be examined by a licensed physician. No marriage license can be issued unless the certificate is presented stating that the applicant has been so examined, and found free from acquired venereal diseases, as nearly as could be determined by physical examination, and by the application of the recognized clinical and laboratory tests of scientific research. The law as it now stands only requires clinical and laboratory tests when the examining physician believes them to be necessary, and the physician is allowed to charge a fee of \$2. Free laboratory service is provided by the state. You will notice that the legislation does not demand clinical and laboratory tests in every case. As our Chairman said a minute ago, a man seeking a medical certificate from a physician who has known the individual for twenty years and has known the individual to be free from venereal disease, such a physician is probably right in 60 or 70 per cent of cases. No law could cover the whole situation. But if any cases can be prevented by a medical certificate, even without any laboratory tests, that would make a law worth while, and that is the reason that this experience in Wisconsin to my mind is convincing—that legislation in Wisconsin has obtained results without laboratory tests in all cases.

*By Hon. Mr. Daniel:*

Q. Take this case: A Doctor gives a certificate of freedom from venereal disease in any shape or form, and the parties get married. It turns out that the first fruits of that marriage—a little girl or a little boy—has hereditary syphilis. Could those parents come back on the Doctor, and prosecute him for giving what turned out to be a false certificate?—A. There could be no possibility there, because—

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Only the male is examined?—A. He does it 15 days before the application, and could easily put up the plea that the disease was contracted in the 15 days prior to the marriage.

*By Hon. Mr. Daniel:*

Q. But the physician ought to be protected?—A. Yes, he ought to be protected.

Q. Is he?—A. With regard to all these 1,110 physicians that point has never been raised, so that that has never been met with in Wisconsin.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. This has been in force 12 years?—A. Yes.

Q. And no physician has been annoyed in this regard?—A. No, no physician has been annoyed in regard to it. The only matter they have complained about is that the law allows a charge of only \$2 to the patient. Some physicians have stated, however, that they have charged as high as \$10 for an examination which had to be more extensive.