

all seriousness before the house committee, the said charge accusing them of a grave and serious breach of discipline in having presented Dr. Stewart with a testimonial of their respect without having first obtained his (the House Doctor's) permission?" This is repeated in one of the other papers under No. 6.

The answer is that it is not true. No objection was ever made to the presentation to Dr. Stewart, but to the use of the Board-room by the nurses without leave asked. The House Surgeon mentioned this verbally to the Chairman, at whose request he made a written report to the house committee. That body pronounced the act to be a breach of discipline, but, under the circumstances, one to be passed over lightly. It is probable that most of the nurses did not know that any formality had been neglected.

12. "Is it true that the House Doctor is in the habit of operating on patients without the permission or knowledge of the visiting staff?"

13. "Is it true that important operations are done without the whole staff being duly notified?" This is No. 7 in one of the other papers, and No. 8 in the other.

To the first of these questions, the answer is that it is not true that the House Doctor is in the habit of operating without the consent, either express or implied, of the member of the visiting staff who has charge of the case. In reply to the latter of the two questions, it is to be said that some laxity has crept in with regard to the notification of operations to the staff; but this has arisen from the laxity in attendance of the members of the staff themselves, and notably so of Dr. Stewart. But notices have been posted up where they could be seen by the visiting physicians and surgeons on their ordinary visits. It might have been thought that a complaint of this sort could have been safely left to the staff to deal with, as they can scarcely be so helpless as to be unable to remonstrate should they feel in any way aggrieved.

14. "Is it true that the House Doctor goes outside to administer ether or chloroform, such being a breach of the rule of the institution?" In one of the other papers this stands as 9, and states that "The House Surgeon administers chloroform to private patients of other medical men outside the Hospital."

It is true that the House Surgeon does this; but it is not so clear that it is against the rules. By-law No. 2, section 35, says, "The House Surgeon shall not practise out of the house." The question whether the administration of anæsthetics, at the request of other medical men, and to their patients, should be considered as "practising" was brought before the Medical Society by Dr. Murray-Aynsley himself, and the question, considered as one of medical ethics, was determined in the negative. It seems that Dr. Murray-Aynsley is regarded as specially expert in the doctrine and practice of anæsthetics, and, if medical practitioners outside the Hospital desire his assistance. I do not see why he should be debarred from rendering it, so long as neither the Medical Society, from its point of view, nor the Hospital Board, from the one proper to itself, makes any objection. The latter body can, of course, at any time put a stop to the practice, if it should become desirable to do so.

15. "Is it true that the House Doctor, on his rounds through the wards, frequently smokes cigarettes, greatly to the annoyance of the patients?" This is No. 8 in another paper.

The answer is that it is not true.

16. "Is it true that a poor dying girl, full of sores, after a long wearisome journey by rail, was brutally turned away from the Hospital-doors at 9 o'clock at night, to find a bed elsewhere?" This is No. 10 in one of the other papers.

The incident here referred to happened on the 4th June, 1894. On that day the patient, Ellen Kennelly, was brought down from Hawarden by her relative, John O'Carroll, and taken to the Hospital in a cab at about 8 o'clock p.m. On the way to town Mr. O'Carroll sent a telephonic message from Sefton to notify to the House Surgeon that a patient was coming, but, as he had to continue his journey by the train, he could not receive a reply. A reply was, however, sent by the House Surgeon to say that there was no room for the patient. On arrival at the Hospital the House Surgeon objected to take the patient in, and an altercation followed between him and Mr. O'Carroll. This was ended by the doctor ringing up a nursing-home (Rowen's) to inquire if the patient could be admitted there, and on receiving an affirmative reply she was taken there. Whilst the discussion was going on the patient remained in the cab, and was not in any way examined by the doctor. The following day, through the mediation of Mr. Gray, a member of the Hospital Board, the patient was admitted to the Hospital, where she died the same day. The accounts given by Mr. O'Carroll and Dr. Murray-Aynsley respectively of what passed between them on the evening of the 4th, as might be expected, do not quite harmonize. The former says that he pressed the doctor to examine the patient, but unsuccessfully. The doctor, on the other hand, says that he gathered from the conversation that the illness was not of long duration, or very serious, and that he was encouraged in this motion by the circumstance that O'Carroll insisted not so much on the urgency of the case as upon the fact that he was able to pay for her accommodation in the Hospital. The doctor thought that in that case she might as well be at a nursing-home. In Mr. O'Carroll's evidence there are certainly signs of animus. He appeared to be reluctant even to admit that it was the doctor who directed them to the nursing-home, and his suggestion that the doctor was not sober, with his reasons for it, look very like an afterthought. O'Carroll says he never got out of the cab, and that if the doctor had been sober he would have known it. But in that case the cabman, John Howard, must have been intoxicated also, for he believes that O'Carroll did get out of the cab. The suggestion of drunkenness, in my opinion, is quite unworthy of credit. Nevertheless, the cabman confirms O'Carroll's statement that he did ask the doctor several times to look at the patient, and that the doctor's manner was rough and angry. I think that, after making every allowance for the scarcity of beds, and for the circumstance that the doctor, before sending the patient away, assured himself that she could be taken to a suitable institution, it yet cannot be denied that in this instance he committed a grave error of judgment. If this precaution had not