219 H.-1.

the Trustees wanted the Government to appoint a Commission to inquire into this matter, and others wanted a Coroner's inquest to be held. At the suggestion of Mr. White, who is one of the Trustees, it was decided, while the discussion was going on, to ring up Mr. Carew, and to inquire of him whether he could hold a coroner's inquest—we had received a letter from Dr. Batchelor on this matter—and Mr. Carew said "No," that the matter would have to be reported to him by the police. Mr. Carew was further asked if, in the event of the Trustees holding a post-mortem examination, it would be sufficient, and Mr. Carew replied "No," that he would have to order a postmortem examination.

Mr. Carew: I said that a post-mortem, to be legal, must be held under my order.

Witness: When the result of the conversation with Mr. Carew was reported to the Trustees it was unanimously decided to ask the Government to appoint a Commission for the purpose of hold-

ing this inquiry, and it was decided to hold a post-mortem examination of the body.

5335. Mr. White.] As to the post-mortem, there is an element which you have not mentioned, which is that the resolution of the Trustees covers the consent of the husband being obtained?—Yes. In the event of the husband refusing to allow a post-morten we were to get the

Coroner to hold an inquiry.

5336. Then what happened?—Dr. Batchelor, in his letter, had stated that he would be present to give any further information on the matter which might be thought necessary. I mentioned that Dr. Batchelor was in waiting, and was asked to intimate to him that the Trustees had agreed to ask the Government to hold an inquiry, and had decided to hold a post-mortem, and to request Dr. Batchelor to make no statement for the present, but that it should be reserved for the inquiry. Dr. Batchelor came into the room, and I told him this. He suggested that Dr. Roberts (pathologist of the Hospital) and Dr. Ogston should be appointed to hold the post-mortem, but it was found that Dr. Ogston could not act, and the Trustees elected Dr. Jeffcoat in his stead.

5337. Were the medical staff invited?—I asked the secretary to intimate that the post-morten would be held, and informing them that they could be present if they liked. I thought it would be

well if they were there, but I did not invite them to be present.

5338. The minute goes on to say: "The chairman stated that Dr. Batchelor had intimated to him that he would be present to give the Trustees any further information they might require in reference to his letter re the circumstances attending Mrs. S——'s death. It was decided to inform Dr. Batchelor that, as the Trustees had decided to apply for a special Commission to hold an inquiry, it was not necessary that he should make any further statement." Was that the actual position ?-Yes.

5339. Dr. Batchelor then left the room?—Yes.

5340. Did he come back again ?—He made a remark in a half-jocular way: "Am I supposed to be on my trial in this matter?"

5341. He did not say, "Any way, my letter will be made public"?—Oh, yes. He said, "Of course my letter will be published."

5342. The Chairman.] What else took place?—As far as my memory serves me, when he said "Of course my letter will be made public," I said, "Decidedly; the inquiry is to be a public one;" and from the fact that we had agreed to ask the Government to hold a public inquiry there was not the slightest use in asking that his letter should be made public then.

5343. Mr. Solomon.] Is not this the resolution of the Trustees: "Resolved, That the Government be requested to appoint a special Commission to inquire into the alleged insanitary state of the Hospital wards," &c.?—I do not know I am sure.

5344. There seems to me some misunderstanding about these letters. Dr. Batchelor has sworn that that is a true copy of the letter which he sent to you after the letter of the 23rd: are you prepared to say that it is not so?—I am not prepared to say that it is not a copy. Unfortunately, I placed little importance on that letter, and it got destroyed among some other of my papers.

Wednesday, 10th September, 1890.

Dr. John Macdonald sworn and examined.

5345. Mr. Chapman.] What is your name?—John Macdonald. 5346. What are your medical qualifications?—I am a duly-qualified registered medical practitioner in New Zealand, am a member of the College of Surgeons in England, and a member of the College of Physicians in England. I am a licentiate of King's College and of the Royal College of Surgeons, and also hold a diploma from the College of Surgeons, England.

5347. Are you on the teaching-staff of the Otago University?—Yes; I am lecturer on materia

5348. In addition you are on the medical staff of the Hospital?—Yes.

5349. The Chairman.] Since when?—I have been a member of the staff for ten years. 5350. Mr. Chapman.] You were chairman last year?—I was. 5351. How long have you been in practice?—For thirty years.

5352. How many years have you been in practice in Dunedin?—A little over twelve years.

5353. And for the remainder of the time in Great Britain?—For about twenty years.
5354. What hospital experience have you had in Great Britain? What hospitals there do you know?—I know the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, the Lincoln County Hospital, and the small hospitals of Kidderminster and Worcester.

5355. Do you know any of the London hospitals?—No. 5356. Do you know any of the hospitals in New Zealand?—I have seen the Christchurch and Nelson Hospitals.

5357. Lately?—I saw the Nelson Hospital in July last, but it is upwards of five years since I saw the Christenurch Hospital.