

been taken the incident might perhaps have justified the expression of "Tongariro" that the girl "was brutally turned away"; but the use of such phraseology, whilst omitting all mention of the nursing-home, is in keeping with the partisan and disingenuous spirit which pervades his letter. There is no reason to think that the patient's life could have been prolonged in any case, since she was in the last stage of tuberculosis, but it is a deplorable thing that in her condition any difficulty whatever should have been placed in the way of her prompt admission. It is right to add that the House Surgeon candidly admits that he made a mistake on this occasion, and that had he examined the patient he would have found room for her.

17. "Is it true that a man who had a sudden stroke of paralysis was refused admission into the Hospital on the ground that the Hospital was not a proper place for such cases?" This appears as No. 11 in one of the other papers, and, in the third, the name of the patient is mentioned in a list of those in respect of whom the House Surgeon is charged with "cruelty, indifference, and neglect." It stands as No. 11.

This is the case of Albert Burt, particulars of which are given in the evidence of J. A. Frostick, of Dr. Murray-Aynsley, and of Dr. Mickle. The patient had an attack of paralysis, and the House Surgeon desired to have the opinion of a legally-qualified and responsible medical practitioner before sanctioning his admission to the Hospital. Although Mr. Frostick felt irritated at what he considered unnecessary delay, yet the event showed that the House Surgeon had rightly judged that such cases should not be moved without medical advice. Dr. Stewart, who saw the patient, says it was unquestionably a case for admission, but Dr. Mickle, who was called in, did not think it then safe to remove him; but in the course of a few days, his condition then admitting of it, he was taken in, and did well.

18. "Is it true that a man (an accident) was turned away recently from the Hospital, the House Doctor telling him there was nothing the matter with him, while he is at present under treatment for a fractured leg?" This is No. 12 in one of the other papers, and in the third it is referred to in No. 11 before mentioned.

This is the case of Robert Green. The facts, as shown by his own evidence and that of his medical attendant, Dr. Irving, are, that he was admitted for an injury arising from a blow upon the upper part of the shin-bone. There was no fracture at that place, and attention was not drawn to any other part. The patient did not wish to go to the Hospital, and did not wish to stay there, being desirous to go home and be attended by his own doctor. Accordingly he went out, after being in the Hospital about eight days. Afterwards he appears to have made the discovery for himself that the bone was movable at a point lower down, and Dr. Irving, on examination, found a fracture at the spot pointed out. Dr. Irving describes it as a "crack," which caused no displacement, and might quite easily be overlooked. I may add that I have myself heard one of the most eminent surgeons in London say, many years ago, that he had never seen a case of fracture of the tibia without the fibula, or small bone of the leg, being broken too. So that the case must be looked upon as remarkable and unusual, and the omission to notice the fracture a thing that might happen to any surgeon. Moreover, no harm came of the oversight, and the patient himself does not appear to have made it a cause of complaint. One would scarcely have expected to find one surgeon bringing up a case like this to damage the reputation of another.

This completes the statement of charges—or, rather, of questions implying them—in "Tongariro's" letter; but it will be convenient, as before said, to deal in the present connection with the remainder of those set out in the other two papers.

The list of cases in which cruelty, indifference, and neglect are alleged, comprises, besides the cases already considered, other names which I shall now take in order:—

Mrs. Elliston: The substance of this patient's complaints is that Dr. Murray-Aynsley, having, when acting in Dr. Murdoch's absence for the Charitable Aid Board, sent her into the Hospital for feeding-up and special treatment preparatory to an operation, she got neither the feeding-up nor the special treatment. Dr. Murray-Aynsley confirms the statement that she came in for the purpose of being fed up for an operation, but he did not think that the use of the syringe, which was the special treatment she looked for, was necessary in her case. In respect of the diet, I think that she probably had some cause for complaint. I have already referred to the meal-hours, and I can only repeat that it is idle to bring patients into a hospital to be "fed-up," and then to give them nothing between a meal of tea and bread and butter at 4.30 p.m. and a breakfast of porridge and bread and butter at 7.30 the next morning. It seems right, also, that a little special attention should be given to cases in which, from some cause or other, the usual meal cannot be relished, and the patient should not be allowed to go without anything until the next meal. But it is difficult to see why a special accusation is made against the House Surgeon in this particular case. The patient says that she never complained to him all the time she was there, and he may naturally have thought she had nothing to complain of. As to the medical treatment, if the staff surgeon whose name was on her card never, as she says, saw her, that is his responsibility. The House Surgeon, not deeming any special treatment required, may have seen no necessity to send for the surgeon in charge of the case, and no special request appears ever to have been made to him on the subject. It may be added that Mrs. Elliston seems to be a person not likely to minimise any grievance, and on a subsequent occasion, when the matron came to her house with Dr. Murdoch to inquire what she had been complaining of, Mrs. Elliston became somewhat abusive, so that the doctor thought it best to shorten the interview.

Mrs. Pankhurst: This case need not detain us long. The ground of complaint is chiefly that the patient was sent out of the Hospital before she was fit to go. There is nothing to show that this was the case. The doctor considered her fit to go, and, her bed being wanted, he may not have felt desirous to keep her in longer than was necessary after finding out from other sources that she had told him a falsehood, as she herself admits, in saying that she had no home to go to. This patient's complaints of the food may be well founded, but this comes under a different head.