

George Tibbs: Any one who will read this man's evidence will, perhaps, find it as difficult as I do to explain why he was called to substantiate charges of cruelty, indifference, and neglect against the House Surgeon. So far as he is personally concerned, his evidence tells all the other way. The incident of the fever-ward merely requires the explanation that there was no danger of infection from entering it, as some of the patients seem to have supposed. Tibbs gives some evidence about Lennie's removal; but this case will be noticed in its turn.

F. J. Montague: This man stated in his evidence that he was five or six days in the Hospital; but the evidence of the House Surgeon, supported by the Hospital records, shows that he was admitted on the 11th of March, and went away of his own accord on the morning of the 13th. This does not prepare us to place implicit confidence in the accuracy of his statements. He had been hurt by a fall from a horse, and came into the Hospital suffering from pains in the stomach and an injury to the shoulder. He was put on milk diet, and, being dissatisfied with this, he went out. His shoulder was either not attended to, or was rubbed with liniment. He says his shoulder was out, and still remained so, but no evidence was called to prove this. I made an examination of his arm myself, and found no reason to think it had been dislocated, but it had been severely bruised, and the muscles were wasted and comparatively powerless. This man was first examined by Mr. Brown, the chief wardman, who appears not to have discovered the injury to the shoulder. The House Surgeon states that the amount of his work makes it necessary for him to trust very much to the examination made by Brown of any patient who comes in when he is absent, and it must be remembered that Brown does practically fill the place of an assistant-surgeon. The system is, I think, by no means to be approved, but so it is. I am rather incredulous about Montague having called the special attention of either Brown or the doctor to his shoulder; but, if he had done so, it does not seem that any very special treatment was required beyond rest, if the theory of dislocation be rejected, as I think it must. If he had remained in the Hospital there can be no doubt that this injury would very soon have been observed; but his voluntary departure, after being only one clear day in the Hospital, takes away the ground of his complaint. It may be here noted that Mrs. Neill says that an injury of this sort could not have failed to be discovered by a nurse trained in modern methods, and properly applying them.

Edward Strange: This case will be found in the evidence of Mrs. Henrietta Grimsey, the lad's mother. I hardly know what the House Surgeon has to answer in this matter, unless it be that he sat on the table and protested against people giving trouble by coming on the wrong days. It was also implied that some neglect was shown in failing to put a protective plate on the boy's head for three months after the operation of trephining. But no medical evidence has been called to show that anything wrong was done or anything right omitted. The case proves no neglect on the part of the doctor, but very great pains on the part of his accusers in bringing forward everything that offered any prospect of making good some imputation against him.

James Lennie: Already referred to as mentioned in the evidence of George Tibbs. The complaint is that this man, who was partly paralytic, was dragged out of the Hospital with violence, and afterwards left outside his own door, where there was no one to receive him. The facts are that he was directed to be sent out by Dr. Deamer, and that when the time came he would not go, and force had to be used to get him into the cab. I think it is apparent, from his own evidence, that no very great violence was used in getting him to the cab, and that other accounts have been rather exaggerated. He was taken to the Charitable Aid Board office, and thence to his own home, Whitelaw, a porter of the Hospital, going with him. What occurred after leaving the Hospital must be gathered by comparing Lennie's own evidence with that of Whitelaw. But the House Surgeon is only concerned with the former part of the business, and, although it is impossible to say whether milder measures might have been successful in inducing the patient to accept the necessity of going out, I do not think it has been shown that the doctor did anything wrong.

Mr. Rye: The complaint in this case is that the patient was sent out of the Hospital prematurely, and that he died a week after going home. This patient had cardiac and renal disease. A week before he finally left the Hospital he had gone home on a visit, and returned again. When he finally went out it was at his own wish. His disease might end in cardiac effusion at any time. He was quite comfortable in the Hospital, and there was no complaint of his treatment. I find no ground for this charge.

Robertson: There is nothing to say in this case, as no evidence has been tendered.

James Pearson: I mention this and the following case here because they belong properly to this connection, and evidence has been led upon them, although they have no place in the list of charges. This man was treated for a broken leg, and it was not discovered until three weeks after he came in that there was also a fracture of the thigh. This certainly ought, according to the recognised rules for the examination of surgical cases, to have been found out at first. But this case presents the remarkable feature that the patient himself never felt or complained of any injury to the thigh. This, although not entirely excusing, readily accounts for the mistake in which Dr. Stewart avows himself to be a participator with the House Surgeon.

Miss Graham: This patient is alleged to have been sent, or, rather, allowed to go, out of the Hospital when seriously ill. The particulars are given in the evidence of Margaret Graham, Anne Walker, Dr. Gosset, Nurse Ewart, and Dr. Murray-Aynsley. The patient went direct from the Hospital to Mrs. Walker's house, stayed there one clear day, and on the next went on by rail to Southbridge. There she was to ill to go on to her home, but she went there a fortnight after, and she died in about three months. There seems no doubt that she was very unwell when she got to Mrs. Walker's, but she had walked there from the tram, a distance of about half a mile. She had been in the Hospital for an operation on the eye, from the effects of which she had recovered, and the House Surgeon says was becoming "hospitalised," and was in a fit state to be discharged. She went out by her own desire, being anxious to get home. Dr. Gosset, who saw her the morning after her arrival at Southbridge, was surprised at her having been allowed to leave the Hospital the day before—that is, the 1st November—not being aware that she had left on the 30th October. He