

The letters of Mr. Alexander Fiddes, F.R.C.S., Edin. considered and refuted, his misrepresentations exposed, his calumnies and innuendoes set in the light of truth, his various statements in the press and otherwise weighed in the balance and found wanting / by Lewis Quier Bowerbank ; together with documentary letters and papers, tending to expose a professional conspiracy, and to afford the public in the colonies, and in Great Britain, correct judgment as to the controversy now existing on hospital matters.

Contributors

Bowerbank, Lewis Q.
Great Britain. Colonial Office. Library
King's College London

Publication/Creation

Kingston, Jamaica : George Henderson, 1865.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/arc546w4>

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by King's College London. The original may be consulted at King's College London. where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

COLONIAL OFFICE
LIBRARY



Transferred on permanent loan

MMVII

KING'S
College
LONDON

FCO2 RA984.J36 BOW

Library


Bowerbank, Lewis &
The letters of Mr. Alexander Fieber,
F.R.C.S., Edin, considered and refuted

1865

201173924 5



KINGS COLLEGE LONDON



THE LETTERS

OF

MR. ALEXANDER FIDDES, F.R.C.S., EDIN.

Considered and refuted, his misrepresentations exposed,
his calumnies and inuendoes set in the light of
truth—his various Statements in the Press
and otherwise weighed in the balance
and found wanting,

BY

LEWIS QUIER BOWERBANK,

L.R.C.S., EDIN., M.D.—F.R.C.P., EDIN.

TOGETHER WITH

DOCUMENTARY LETTERS AND PAPERS,

Tending to expose a Professional Conspiracy, and to
afford the Public in the Colonies, and in Great
Britain, correct judgment as to the Con-
troversy now existing on Hospital
Matters.

"MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PRÆVALEBIT."

KINGSTON, JAMAICA :

George Henderson, Printer and Publisher, Kingston and Spanish Town.

1865.



1168130

TO THE READER.

THE following pages are submitted to the judgment and candid consideration of the Medical Profession, as well as of the public in general.

The Author regrets deeply the necessity which has been laid upon him, of exposing and contradicting so many misrepresentations by which his private and professional character has been aspersed ; and which if unanswered, might have been supposed by some persons at least to admit of no satisfactory reply.

In one respect the Author feels that an apology is due to his Readers. He has endeavoured, as far as the circumstances of the case would permit, to avoid language unnecessarily acrimonious and offensive ; he felt that he would have been humiliated by replying in the coarse and vituperative style in which he has been assailed ; and he could not condescend to resort to exciting and exaggerated epithets as a substitute for arguments and facts.

At the same time, he is aware that he has been compelled to transgress the usual bounds of professional courtesy, which could not have been observed, except at the sacrifice of truth and plain speaking.

LEWIS QUIER BOWERBANK.

Kingston, 7th October, 1865,

TO THE READER

The first of these is the fact that the language of the book is not only simple and clear, but also is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader. The second is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader.

The third is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader. The fourth is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader.

The fifth is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader. The sixth is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader.

The seventh is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader. The eighth is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader.

The ninth is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader. The tenth is the fact that the book is so arranged as to be easily understood by the reader.

THE END

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Colonial Standard.

KINGSTON, 23rd January, 1865.

SIR,—As several of my friends have requested me to lay before the public, a statement of the circumstances which led to my resignation of the office which I recently held in the Public Hospital, I have been induced to accede to their desire, not from any wish to obtrude my official conduct on the public, but chiefly with the view of correcting certain misrepresentations which have been circulated, with regard to the reasons which induced me to sever my connection with this institution, in which, for a period of nearly three years, I have served as one of its Chief Medical Officers.

It has been alleged that I was induced to tender my resignation of office, in consequence of the recent alterations or changes which the Governor has thought fit to make, with regard to the periodical retirement of the Medical Officers, and that my inability to remain in the Hospital, as a permanent member of the Medical Staff, was the principal cause of my resignation of office. But such is not the case. I never had, and have not now, any particular desire to act in such a capacity ; but in order to show this more clearly, it is necessary that I should enumerate somewhat in detail, the circumstances which first led to my late official connection with the Institution.

On the occasion of the vacancy in the Hospital Medical Staff, which occurred by the death of Dr. McGrath in 1858, I was requested to put forward my claims to that appointment, and received every assurance of being elected to the office if I desired to hold it, I declined, however, and left the way open for Dr. Bowerbank, who had signified his desire to obtain the situation. He canvassed the votes of the Hospital Commissioners, in whom the patronage was vested, and he did so unopposed by me, and if I remember rightly, by any body else. The Commissioners, however, for reasons best known to themselves, did not entertain his application, and from the moment of his rejection, Dr. Bowerbank commenced his famous Hospital Campaign, which after a duration of four years, was temporarily suspended, but not terminated, by the removal of Dr. Scott, from his office of principal Medical Officer of the Hospital. This gentleman's connection with the Hospital, terminated in March 1862, and on the 20th of that month Governor Darling wrote to me requesting that I would agree to act as Dr. Scott's successor. At that time I had become so disgusted at the discreditable manner in which the Hospital controversy had been conducted, that I felt no desire whatever to form any official connection with the Institution, and this feeling on my part seems to have been pretty well under-

stood, for early in the morning of the 21st March, the day after I had received Governor Darling's letter, Dr. Bowerbank and Dr. Campbell called upon me at my residence, and urged upon me the propriety of stepping forward and occupying the vacant post in the Hospital, and among other inducements which these gentlemen held out to me, was the important one, that in future everything would go on pacifically in the Institution. But I had not made up my mind on the subject, and it was not until I had a personal interview with Governor Darling and discussed the matter with him that I consented to act. I accordingly entered upon my Hospital duties, certainly, not without misgivings, but still with the hope that in the conduction of the Institution I would not encounter factious or vexatious opposition.

Towards the end of that year, a new hospital bill was passed by the Legislature, and came into force early in 1863. This bill was drawn up by Dr. Bowerbank by direction of Governor Eyre and his then Executive Committee. The formality was gone through of shewing the bill to Dr. Dunn and myself, prior to its final reading in the House of Assembly, and being struck with the extraordinary nature of some of its provisions, I suggested some six or seven alterations, but as I had reason to anticipate, not one of my suggestions was carried into effect.

Early in 1863, Governor Eyre consulted me personally with reference to the working of the new Act, and at this period I was so impressed with its anomalous character, that I then stated to his Excellency that I had no particular wish to continue longer as a Medical Officer of the Hospital, and that if he knew of any gentleman who might be desirous to fill my situation, I would not stand in his way.

His Excellency seemed desirous, however, that I should remain in the Institution, and still entertaining a hope, that the hospital machinery might work properly, I consented to do so. I had not yet ascertained fully that a Government which had been held by a Metcalfe, an Elgin, and a Grey, had actually fallen into the hands of a man of so feeble a capacity, that he could not or would not use the ability with which Providence has endowed him, but like a young schoolboy, was necessitated to repeat his lessons under the dictation of his nurse; but I was soon undeceived, for early in May, 1863, I found Dr. Bowerbank (who had been elected to the office of Chairman of the Board of Visitors under the new law) engaged in fanning the flame of a hospital conspiracy, got up with the special object of crushing one of the Resident Medical Officers. True it is that I found this honorable and straight forward gentleman maintaining a correspondence with the individual who had initiated the conspiracy, supplying him with writing materials and otherwise inciting him to prosecute his charges, without myself being in any way informed of the existence of any complaint, although I was several hours daily in the wards of the hospital, and was accessible to any patient who might have grievances to urge.

On ascertaining the facts connected with this reprehensible transaction, Dr. Dunn and myself immediately protested against so unwarrantable a procedure on the part of Dr. Bowerbank, and we

conjointly submitted to the Board of Visitors the following letter on the subject :—

PUBLIC HOSPITAL, 6th May, 1863.

“ Sir,—As a special meeting of the Board of Visitors will be held to-day to enquire into certain charges preferred by Allan McRae, a patient, against Dr. Stern, Senior Resident Medical Officer, we think proper to direct your attention and that of the Official Visitors, to the anomalous course of procedure which has led to the institution of this enquiry.

“ We are aware, that by the provisions of the Hospital Law, any member of the Board of Visitors may call and inspect the hospital at any time, and may examine any officer, servant, nurse or inmate, as he may think fit ; but we do not perceive that the Act has invested any member of the Board with power to act as the Chairman has done in the case which is to be the subject of investigation to-day.

“ It would be premature to say anything now with regard to the charges made by the patient McRae against Dr. Stern : these will be, doubtless, examined carefully, and judged impartially ; but we must be permitted to observe that the whole of the preliminary procedure between McRae and the Chairman, appears to have been irregular, inasmuch as the subject of McRae's complaints was initiated, and carried to where it now stands, without reference to either of the Ordinary Medical Officers, or to the Inspector and Director.

“ We submit that the adoption of a practice like this, would reduce the position of the Medical Officers, and that of the Inspector and Director to a nullity ; it would subvert all hospital discipline, and speedily effect the demoralization of the Institution.

“ We object to any member of the Board of Visitors sanctioning or holding an outside correspondence with patients in the Hospital, particularly in cases where the responsible officers of the Institution have received no intimation of the existence of any complaint.

“ The question of interference with patients, by members of the Board of Visitors, is very important, and the extent and limits of such interference should be settled definitely without delay.

“ We are willing to carry out the duties of the hospital to the best of our ability, but we have no wish to hold our appointments on any other terms than such as are compatible with professional propriety ; and we object to act under any system of Hospital Government, which would tend to keep the Institution in a state of perpetual disturbance.

“ We have to request that you will be good enough to lay this letter before the meeting of the Board of Visitors to-day, and that you will also transmit a copy of it to his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor.”

“ We are,

“ Your obdt. servants,

ANDREW DUNN,

ALEXANDER FIDDES,

“ Ordinary Medical Officers,

“ To D. P. TRENCH, Esqr., Inspector and Director.”

The Board of Visitors sat for seven consecutive days, to investigate the subject of this inquiry, and at one of their meetings, on the 20th May, I individually tendered to them the following letter, with the view of pointing out to the Board the improper course which the Chairman had pursued :—

“PUBLIC HOSPITAL, 20th May, 1863.

“Sirs—As the visiting Medical Officer of No 2 division of the hospital, which is under the care of Dr. Stern and from which the patient McRae preferred the charges against this officer, which are now the subject of enquiry by this Board, I have to crave your indulgence for leave to make a few observations with reference to this case.

“It is certainly no business of mine to interfere, either by words or by deeds with the functions which this Board exercises according to law, and it would not be fit or proper in me to make any remarks which might appear calculated to influence the members of the Board, or to prejudice their decision in regard to the charges which have been advanced by McRae against Dr. Stern, but I may be permitted to observe, nevertheless, that the matter of this complaint which has now occupied the attention of the Board for four days, and which has also demanded the attendance of all the Medical Officers of the hospital during that time, might probably have been settled equitably and satisfactorily in a few minutes, if a proper course of procedure, in the first instance, had been adopted.

“The plan which hospital patients should follow to obtain redress of real or imaginary grievances, would be to speak to the Resident Medical Officer in charge; but if the complaint happen to be against this officer himself, the complainant should apply to the ordinary Visiting Medical Officer, and should he not succeed in obtaining redress from him, he should appeal to the Inspector and Director; and, in the event of that application also failing, the complainant would act properly in applying to any member of the Board of Visitors.

“But in the case which is now the subject of investigation by this Board, the course here indicated was not pursued. McRae made no complaint to the Visiting Medical Officer of his ward against Dr. Stern, although he had every opportunity to do so, neither did he mention any grievances to the Inspector and Director, but at once opened a correspondence with the Chairman of this Board, outside the hospital, which necessarily led to the enquiry which now engages your attention, an enquiry which Dr. Dunn and myself, in our letter of the 6th inst., (now before the Board) designated as anomalous and irregular, inasmuch as the preliminary procedure attending it has been contrary to the rules and usages by which all well-regulated hospitals are governed.

“I may be permitted to state, that since my appointment as a Medical Officer of the hospital, now rather more than a year ago, the period of my daily attendance at the Institution has ranged from one to five hours—the average being probably from two to three hours. I submit that such period of daily visitation is ample to al-

low every patient full opportunity to speak with me on grievances, or on any other subject: and, consequently, that statements like those made by McRae, if communicated to parties outside the hospital, without reference to the responsible officers inside, should be viewed with suspicion and distrust, and it will generally be found that patients making those irregular charges against Officers of the Institution, have been influenced in doing so, either by malice and ill-will, or by a propensity to provoke mischief and stir up strife.

"It should be borne in mind that among the inmates of the Kingston Hospital, there is always a considerable number of bad characters—sailors who have broken their engagements, and left their ships, and men who, when out of hospital, pass a good deal of their time in prison, or in the General Penitentiary; and in corroboration of this statement, I may mention that during the last few weeks there was treated, as a patient in the hospital, one of the most incorrigible scoundrels who has figured in the annals of the latter penal establishment.

"If these and other analogous facts be duly considered, it will, I think, be allowed that any interference with patients, by members of the Board of Visitors, tending to lessen the authority of the responsible officers of the Institution, cannot have a wholesome or salutary effect on the management.

"I leave the important question herein involved with the Board, and with the Government, for consideration and settlement, feeling assured that the decision which will be made in regard to it will be such as may tend to uphold the discipline of the hospital, and to promote its general welfare; but I would be wanting in duty to myself, to the hospital, and to the profession to which I have the honor to belong, if I failed to protest against any repetition of that unusual mode of hospital management, upon which I have now been necessitated to give my opinion.

"I am, your obdt. servant,

"ALEX. FIDDES,

"Ordinary Medical Officer of the Public Hospital.

"To the Chairman and Members of the Board of Visitors."

During this investigation the Board was always fully attended, there being present, Dr. Bowerbank, the Chairman; His Lordship the Bishop, the Rector of Kingston, the Rev. Mr. Edmondson, the principal Medical Officer of her Majesty's Army; the principal Medical Officer of her Majesty's Navy, the Hon. George Solomon, and Charles Levy, Esquire.

After a full and patient enquiry, these gentlemen framed a Report, in which they unanimously agreed that the charges made by the patient McRae against Dr. Stern, were unfounded and vexatious, and that there was no ground whatever for the entertainment of his complaint.

To this Report Dr. Bowerbank dissented, and considered it necessary to furnish a Report of his own, with the object apparently of making a wild and unjustifiable attack upon every Officer of the Institution. His Report was duly forwarded to Government, along with that of the Board of Visitors; and if Governor Eyre had possessed the rudiments of Governmental knowledge, he would have

immediately sent back the offensive document to its author, and requested him not to send any further Reports to Government that were in direct antagonism with the carefully considered decisions of the whole Board of Visitors.

But Governor Eyre not only received Dr. Bowerbank's one sided Report, but proceeded quickly to act upon its suggestions, for he forthwith sent down to the hospital his censure upon Dr. Stern, and some other Officers of the Institution, based entirely upon Dr. Bowerbank's representation.

In the meantime, Dr. Dunn and myself had written to the Governor to furnish us with a copy of Dr. Bowerbank's Report, in order that we might answer the allegations which it contained; but after a lapse of sixteen days, and finding that no notice had been taken of our communication, we again addressed his Excellency on the subject, reminding him of the necessity of furnishing us with a copy of Dr. Bowerbank's document, which contained such serious charges against the hospital management. His Excellency at last complied with our request, and sent down a copy of the Report; but on analysing the document, we discovered in it so many mistatements and palpable untruths, that we were compelled to write plainly with regard to its spurious character—and we then took occasion to tell his Excellency, that if he believed the allegations of Dr. Bowerbank to be well founded, it were better that we should both retire from the hospital, rather than remain in a situation where our services would neither be beneficial to the public nor creditable to ourselves; but if, on the other hand, he considered Dr. Bowerbank's averments to be incorrect, then it would be necessary that he should allow the Medical Officers of the hospital fair play in the discharge of their official duty. Our reply to Dr. Bowerbank's Report seems to have produced some effect upon the Government, for the Governor sent down a message to the hospital immediately afterwards, cancelling and withdrawing the censures which he had previously passed upon certain Officers of the hospital, on the strength of Dr. Bowerbank's *EX PARTE* statement, and at the same time he forwarded a letter to Dr. Dunn and myself expressing his satisfaction with the manner in which the hospital had been conducted; but strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that when a Committee of the House of Assembly, (which was appointed to report upon the condition of the hospital) sent down an order, that all correspondence between the Board of Visitors and the Government, and also that between the Medical Officers and the Government, should be furnished for their information, the Governor thought fit to write immediately to Mr. Trench to stop the transmission of the correspondence between the Medical Officers and the Government, although he made no objection to the several communications which had passed between the Board of Visitors and the Government, being laid before this Committee of the House of Assembly. In other words, although Governor Eyre expressed his readiness to receive the condemnatory Report of Dr. Bowerbank against the Medical Officers of the hospital, he signified his intention not to acknowledge the written statements which they had made in their own defence.

From this circumstance I concluded, and I think rightly, that Governor Eyre had abandoned his independence and relinquished his judgment, in hospital matters, to Dr. Bowerbank, and that he was little more than an automaton in his hands. Subsequent transactions in the hospital have not tended to remove this impression, for in the several entries which Dr. Bowerbank has since made in the Visitors' Book, the Governor must have perceived that this gentleman was overstepping the bounds of his official position, and was in fact running counter to all propriety. He should have seen that Dr. Bowerbank's offensive criticism, in the Visitors' Book, with reference to the Annual Report of the Medical Officers for the year 1862-3, a criticism replete with insinuations and arithmetical blunders, was a most improper stretch of official authority, and he should have further perceived that the same censure which Dr. Bowerbank managed to cast upon the Hospital Report for 1863-4, merely because the Medical Officers had expressed their opinion on the salubrity of the hospital site, was an act of official arrogance and presumption beyond the limits of professional endurance.

But the Governor, instead of checking or putting a stop to these improper proceedings, seems rather to have given encouragement to them; and, to cap the climax of the whole, he finally entrusted the Board of Visitors, consisting virtually of Dr. Bowerbank and his two kinsmen, with full power to adjudicate upon the retirement or re-appointment of the several members of the Medical Staff. It may be readily seen how, by a movement of this kind, the Governor so played into Dr. Bowerbank's hands, as to enable him to obtain the object which he so long desired—that of getting the hospital entirely under his own control.

I, being fully cognizant of all the movements in the game, and perceiving that my means of self-defence would be materially diminished by Dr. Dunn's retirement, had no alternative but to resign my office, and accordingly lost no time in forwarding to the Governor, the following letter:—

“PUBLIC HOSPITAL, 29th December, 1864.

“Sir,—Wishing to retire from the office which I now hold in the Public Hospital, I have to request that you will convey to his Excellency the Governor, this desire, so that he may be pleased to appoint another Medical Officer in my stead.

“I am, your obedient servant,

“ALEX. FIDDES.

“To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director.”

After some private correspondence had passed between the Governor and myself, which it would be improper to publish, I received the following official letter from the Governor in Executive Committee:—

“Executive Committee Office,

“4th January, 1865.

“Sir,—I am directed by the Governor in Executive Committee, to acknowledge your letter of the 29th ult., addressed to the Go-

vernor's Secretary and forwarding a communication from Dr. Fiddes, tendering his resignation as one of the Ordinary Medical Officers of the Public Hospital.

"I am to request that you will, without any delay, convey to Dr. Fiddes, the wish of the Government that he would re-consider and withdraw the tender of his resignation, his service being, in their opinion, of very great value to the Institution.

"I have the honor, to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. R. MYERS, Secy.

"To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director."

To this letter I forwarded the following reply:—

"Kingston, 5th January, 1865.

"Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, enclosing a communication from Mr. Secretary Myers of same date, in which you are requested to convey to me the wish of the Government that I would re-consider and withdraw the tender of my resignation as Ordinary Medical Officer of the Public Hospital.

"In reply, I have to state, that I would be willing and happy to continue my professional services in the Hospital, provided I could do so with due regard to my professional position, and with proper respect for the interests of the Institution; but unfortunately the system of Hospital management, under the present Board of Visitors, is such, that no medical man, having regard for his professional character, can possibly serve as one of the responsible Medical Officers of the Institution.

"In a most unjustifiable manner, Dr. Bowerbank has succeeded in driving away from the Board of Visitors nearly all the gentlemen who have been appointed to constitute it, so that the Board is now under the dictation of himself and his two relatives Dr. Charles Campbell, and the Rev. Duncan H. Campbell, and it is evident that the government of the hospital is now vested in Dr. Bowerbank; but inasmuch as this gentleman, from his first official connection with the Hospital to the present time, has endeavoured to thwart and obstruct the measures which have been devised for its improvement, and has done a great deal to plague and annoy the Medical Officers, his presence in the Institution has become a serious difficulty to those connected with its conduction and management, and this interference on his part is the more galling, from the fact that he himself has never afforded any proof of competency to discharge the higher and more important duties which appertain to the practice of a Public Hospital. I beg leave, therefore, to inform the Government, that unless some pledge or guarantee be furnished for the effectual correction of the abuses to which I have thus briefly alluded, I must respectfully decline to continue any longer as a Medical Officer of the Public Hospital.

"I have the honor to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"ALEXANDER FIDDES,

"To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director,"

I had subsequently a personal interview with the Governor and the Executive Committee, with reference to the subject of the Hospital appointments, without arriving at any satisfactory solution of the difficulty; and a few days thereafter I forwarded to the Government the following communication:—

KINGSTON, 9th January, 1865.

"Sir,—I have to request you to inform the Governor, in Executive Committee, that I have given the subject of my resignation from the Hospital my mature consideration, and have to say, that I could not continue my services in the Institution without compromising my professional position.

"I have, therefore, to ask the Governor to relieve me from the duties of my office, by appointing another Medical Officer in my place, at his earliest convenience.

"I am,

"Your obedient servant,

"ALEXANDER FIDDES.

"To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director."

Having waited several days without receiving a reply to this letter, I again addressed his Excellency as follows:—

"PUBLIC HOSPITAL, 19th January, 1865.

"Sir,—In my communication to you of the 9th instant, I requested you to be good enough to forward to his Excellency the Governor, my desire to be relieved of the duties of my office of Ordinary Medical Officer of the hospital. Not having received any reply with reference to my application, and finding that my present position in the Institution is becoming more and more anomalous and uncomfortable, I have again to request you to convey to his Excellency my wish that he will, at his earliest convenience, appoint another Medical Officer in my room.

"I am,

"Your obedient servant,

"ALEXANDER FIDDES.

"To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director."

On the following day I received the annexed letter from the Government:—

GOV. SEC. OFFICE, 19th January, 1865.

"Sir.—In reply to your letter, No. 7, of the 9th instant, I am directed by the Governor, in Executive Committee, to state that whilst they regret that Dr. Fiddes is unable any longer to continue his services as an Ordinary Medical Officer of the Hospital, the decision not to withdraw his resignation, leaves the Governor no alternative but to accept it, and appoint another Medical Officer.

"The Governor and Executive Committee cannot, however, allow Dr. Fiddes to retire without expressing their high sense of his

professional skill and ability, and of the very valuable services he has rendered to the hospital during his tenure of office, for which they tender their best thanks.

"I am to request you to communicate the substance of this letter to Dr. Fiddes.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"HUGH W. AUSTIN, Gov. Sec.

"To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director."

I have thus given a hurried, and I fear a very imperfect sketch of my official connection with the Public Hospital, and endeavoured to show the causes which have led to my retirement from it.

I am glad to say that I have received the support of the members of my profession as to the line of conduct which I have pursued, and I trust that the explanation which I have given will further secure for me the approbation of the public.

I had nothing to gain personally by throwing up a salaried appointment and coming to a rupture with the Governor and Dr. Bowerbank; I would rather have avoided these, but it is evident that I could not have done so without a sacrifice of principle, and my duty to the profession made it imperative on me to act as I have done.—I have willingly and voluntarily retired from the hospital, and given place to Dr. Bowerbank, who has, thereby, secured the long coveted object of his wishes; but what next? Before long there will probably be a reiteration of the old cry *Delenda est Carthago*, that the buildings in North Street must be abandoned, and a new Hospital erected somewhere else; and this will be pleasing to Governor Eyre, who it must be remembered, stands committed to a measure of this kind. But here again the Governor and Dr. Bowerbank will probably find themselves on the horns of a dilemma inasmuch as the Hospital Returns shew that the practice of the Institution up to the end of last year, was such as to stand in very favourable comparison with that of nearly every British Colonial Hospital, and that the results of surgical operations had been more successful than in the principal hospitals of Great Britain. It is also well known that the rate of mortality in the Kingston Hospital has been progressively decreasing, and that there has been a steady improvement in the general economy of the establishment, dependent in a great measure, on reforms and alterations which have been gradually carried into effect.

If Dr. Bowerbank cannot now maintain the professional reputation of the hospital, or if he cannot elevate its practice by means of efficient drainage and other sanitary agencies which have just been brought into practical operation, then it must be evident that his professional status must suffer; but, if on the other hand he should succeed, as I hope he may do, to advance and extend the improvements which have already been in progress, then there will be less cause than ever to tax a poverty-stricken country to raise an enor-

mous amount of money for the establishment of a new hospital.

On one or other of the horns of this dilemma, the Governor and Dr. Bowerbank will be impaled.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

ALEX. FIDDES,

Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh.

To the Editor of the Colonial Standard.

KINGSTON, January 24th, 1865.

Sir,—I have just this moment perused in your paper of to-day's date. a letter headed "Public Hospital Correspondence" and signed "Alexander Fiddes."

Hitherto I had always entertained a high respect for that gentleman, although we had widely differed on hospital matters.

I shall not, Sir, enter into any controversy with Dr. Fiddes, but after reading what he has written, I can only express my surprise at his conduct—at his want of candour and manliness in never having expressed his sentiments to me personally—nay, I may, safely say, in having remained silent when invited to state his reasons for resigning his appointment; but I feel it to be a duty I owe to myself, the Governor, the Executive Committee, and the public, thus to declare that Dr. Fiddes's letter, from beginning to end, as regards myself, my actions and motives, is full of statements which are false, and Dr. Fiddes *ought* to know that they are so.

I have, at the request of the Government, and very much against my own interest and inclination, accepted office, at the Public Hospital. While I hold this, I will do my duty fearlessly and conscientiously, and without subterfuge, and whatever the result may be at the end of the year, I care not; my opinions as to the condition and management of the Public Hospital are well known.

In conclusion, to show the animus of the whole affair, I would draw attention to the fact, that this attack upon my private and professional character—made by a professional brother and pretended friend—appears in the public prints, the very day the Mail is made up for England.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK.

To the Editor of the Colonial Standard.

KINGSTON, January 25th, 1865.

Sir,—I perceive in your Journal of to-day a letter from Dr. Bowerbank, in which he has made some comments upon a letter of mine which appeared in the "Colonial Standard" of yesterday.

I observe that the Doctor, whilst refusing to enter into controversy with me "expresses his surprise at my conduct—at my want of candour and manliness in never having expressed my sentiments to him personally, and in having remained silent when invited to state my reasons for resigning my hospital appointment;" and he declares that my letter "from beginning to end, is full of statements that are false, and that I *ought* to know that they are so."

In reply to these remarkable assertions, I have to say, *firstly*, that Dr. Bowerbank's decision not to have any controversy with me, is a matter beyond my influence and control; but I would inform him, nevertheless, that should he ever have occasion to alter his determination in regard to this decision, he will probably find me willing and ready to meet him in the controversial arena. As to my alleged want of candour and manliness, in never having expressed my sentiments to Dr. Bowerbank personally, and in having remained silent, when invited to state my reasons for resigning my hospital appointment, anybody who has taken, or who may take, the trouble to read through my letter, will see that I have been by no means backward in giving utterance to my sentiments, and they will also perceive from the correspondence contained in the said letter, that I officially conveyed to government, in language as plain and intelligible as I could find, my principal reasons for refusing to remain longer, as one of the Medical Officers of the Public Hospital. As to Dr. Bowerbank's assertion, that my "letter from beginning to end, is full of statements that are false, and that I *ought* to know that they are so," I have only to say, that an off-hand charge of this kind, is certainly a ready method of loosening a Gordian knot, and of escaping from an ugly difficulty, but it is far from being a satisfactory reply to, or a refutation of the statements which are contained in my letter.

That letter is based almost entirely on documentary testimony, and I challenge Dr. Bowerbank to lay his finger on a single sentence of it which is not strictly in accordance with truth.

Finally, Dr. Bowerbank states that "to show the animus of the whole affair, he would draw attention to the fact, that this attack upon his private and professional character, made by a professional brother, and pretended friend, appears in the public prints the very day when the Mail is made up for England."

With reference to this charge, I have to observe that my official connection with the hospital did not terminate until the 20th instant, and up to that period, my hands were tied with regard to making any public hostile criticism on hospital proceedings. I wrote my letter on the 21st, and next day being Sunday, I was unable to put it in the hands of the Printer before the 23rd. It made its public appearance on the 24th, and as the Mail Packet for England was to sail on the morning of the 25th, I saw no good reason for keeping the document back; its transmission to England can do no harm but, on the contrary, may effect a great deal of good.

I am, your obdt. servant.

ALEX FIDDES, F, R. C. S. Edin.

An Editorial from the "Medical Times and Gazette," of the 25th March, 1865, entitled

Colonial Medical Ethics.

We have received from the Island of Jamaica, several newspapers containing portions of the evidence given at an Inquest held on a man who died at the Public Hospital, after an operation for the removal of a broken piece of catheter from the urethra. As far as we can gather from the imperfect information which has reached us, the following were the principal points in the case:—The deceased, Richard Bailey, age 66, was admitted a patient of the Hospital, on January 11, on account of difficulty in passing water. Mr. Fiddes, who was at that time one of the Surgeons to the Institution, found that he was labouring under an impervious condition of the prepuce. This he relieved by a cutting operation on January 16. He then found that the glans penis had been destroyed by previous disease. On January 20 Mr. Fiddes retired from the office of Surgeon to the Hospital, and the Medical and Surgical management of the Institution was undertaken by Dr. Bowerbank and Dr. Anderson. This last named gentleman took charge of Bailey, and, as we suppose, in consequence of what appeared to him the occluded state of the urethra, on January 27 he introduced a No. 2 catheter, and tied it in the bladder. From an accident, stated by one of the patients to have been caused by the man getting out of bed, and hitching the instrument in the iron bedstead—it broke, and a portion six and a-half inches long was left in the urethra. The removal of the retained piece by urethral forceps does not seem to have been attempted. Drs. Bowerbank and Anderson stated that there was no such instrument in the Hospital. Dr. Field, who, we believe, is the resident medical Officer, managed, however, to introduce an instrument by the side of the broken portion into the man's bladder. The foreign body remained in the urethra for nine days. It was then extracted by dividing the posterior portion of the canal. The man sank after the operation, and at the post-mortem examination it was found that the kidneys were in an advanced state of disease—wasted, contracted, and hardened—and that the coats of the bladder were greatly thickened. The integuments of the scrotum were distended with sero-purulent effusion, and the wound in the urethra appeared sloughy and unhealthy.

We believe that had such an unfortunate case happened in any other part of the civilized world, or even in Jamaica at any other time, it would not have been made the subject of a legal inquiry. Whatever may be said about its Surgical management, it was clearly a case which presented no ordinary difficulties, and the practice pursued by the Surgeons in charge of it was, by every rule of Medical ethics, entitled to at least the fair and charitable construction of their Professional brethren. We suppose that nobody doubts that Messrs. Anderson and Bowerbank acted to the best of their judgment and skill, and if every Medical man who meets with an unlucky case, were liable to be summoned before a coroner's jury, on

some hypothetical point of practice, when no charge of criminal neglect or Professional incompetence could be sustained against him, who in his senses would practice the Profession of Medicine? But our readers may remember that the state of Medical politics in Jamaica is at present anything but tranquil.—Dr. Dunn and Mr. Fiddes, the former officers of the Hospital, resigned their posts in consequence of a dispute in which Dr. Bowerbank was a party opposed to them, and they were succeeded by the latter gentleman and his partner, Dr. Anderson. The case of Richard Bailey happening immediately after this change in the Hospital staff, was no doubt freely discussed and commented on. It appears, that Drs. Bowerbank and Anderson, so far from shunning inquiry, courted it by requesting that an inquest might be held. They gave it as their opinion that the man's death was mainly due to the bad hygienic condition in which he was placed, to bad ventilation, a pestiferous atmosphere, a filthy state of the ward, and to diarrhæa, which prevailed in the Hospital at the time. Dr. Allen, another medical man who gave evidence, seemed to think that death was principally to be attributed to uræmic poisoning. None of these suppositions, however, were admitted by the former Surgeons to the Hospital. They allowed their brethren no quarter in this matter. We quote a few extracts from Mr. Fiddes's evidence as specimens of the friendly concern which he evinced for the reputation of his successors. "I consider that the omission of Doctors Anderson and Bowerbank to withdraw the broken catheter immediately after the accident, and their using no means for obtaining the necessary instrument for its extraction, was a most culpable error on their part, an error which ultimately led to the death of Richard Bailey. At the end of nine days' retention of this instrument, they proceeded to execute a measure for the removal of it; and I have no hesitation in stating that the means which they adopted for this purpose were most unjustifiable and unwarrantable." . . . "I repeat that, in defiance of this principle of Surgery" (that operations should not be performed on the urethra and bladder when disease of the kidneys is present), the patient was subjected to a Surgical operation which was unjustifiable and unnecessary." * * * *

"I may state, in conclusion, that I consider Richard Bailey's death, is entirely attributable to the unskilful Surgical ordeal to which he was subjected in the Hospital by Drs. Anderson and Bowerbank; that the treatment of his case was conducted without science and without the exercise of ordinary judgment; that his death has been the necessary and inevitable result of such errors; and that the attempt which has been made by Drs. Bowerbank and Anderson, to attribute the fatal result to bad ventilation, filthiness of the wards, pestiferous exhalations, and other causes, is as illogical and as absurd as if a Surgeon were to say, that a patient who had a carving knife driven through his liver might probably not have died had he not unfortunately neglected to wash his face and comb his hair on the day of the accident!"

The Carribean Islands were, we, believe, discovered by the countrymen of Gil Blas, and whilst reading the account of this Inquest we are tempted to suppose that the code of Drs. Sangrado and Cuchillo still regulates Professional relations in those favoured climes.

We hope that the Jamaica public are edified, and that they will entertain a proper respect for a profession in which the members so readily sacrifice each other to the public good.

[To the Editor of the Medical Times.]

Sir,—In an article in your journal of the 25th March, he added "Colonial Medical Ethics," you have been pleased to make some comments on the proceedings at a Coroner's inquest held in this city on the body of Richard Bailey, who died in the Public Hospital after an operation for the removal of a broken catheter from the urethra, and in reference to the evidence given by the Medical witnesses at this inquiry, you express an opinion that the antiquated "code of Dr. Sangrado and Cuchillo still regulate Professional relations in this quarter of the world."

Admitting that Professional relations here are not so pacific as they might be, I can assure you, nevertheless, that these are not so bad as you have been led to suppose; but be that as it may, I have to remark that neither myself nor any of the eight Medical Practitioners who were examined at the inquest are in any way responsible for the Professional disagreements which have lately occurred.—These have arisen entirely from the extraordinary conduct of one individual, who, in relation to the Public Hospital, has for the last five or six years, set aside the civilities and courtesies of Professional life, and if you will take the trouble to refer to the published documentary testimony which I herewith transmit, you will not fail to perceive that it was my determination to uphold the etiquette of the Profession against the assaults that were being made against it, which lately compelled me to throw up my appointment of Surgeon to the Hospital, and that it was the same feeling which actuated my colleague, Dr. Dunn, in obliging him to refuse the continuation of his services as a medical officer of the institution.

With regard to the conduct of myself and of the other practitioners in the city who gave evidence at the inquest on Richard Bailey, I have only to observe that neither I nor any of them are blameable for the unfortunate result of that inquiry. The inquest was demanded by the inspector of the hospital, and I, with all the members of the profession in the city, was summoned by the Coroner to give evidence thereat. The testimony which was there adduced was no doubt damaging to Drs. Bowerbank and Anderson, the principal medical officers, but it was impossible for any medical witness who had due regard for his own professional reputation, and the sanctity of his oath, to help them out of their difficulty.

What are the facts of Richard Bailey's case? The patient, without any stricture or prostatic disease, but with a urethra sufficiently capacious to admit a No. 14 bougie, had a No. 2 catheter introduced into the bladder, and secured therein by tapes; there appears to have been considerable uneasiness thereafter, and in some way or other the instrument was broken; about four inches of it fell out, the remaining six and a-half inches remained in the urethra and blad-

der; this foreign body—could be felt by external examination, and a No. 12 sound, was readily passed alongside of it into the bladder, yet no attempt was made to remove the broken instrument until after the lapse of nine days; and when a message had come down from Government making inquiry about the case, the patient was then subjected to a cutting operation in the perinæum, from the effect of which he died—at any rate, he sank a few days after the operation, the wound, on dissection, being found black and sloughy, and the coverings of the testes verging on gangrene.

Was it possible for any medical man, conversant with urethral surgery to endorse the propriety of the practice which was adopted in this case? Was the introduction and retention of a No. 2 catheter in a morbidly wide and roomy urethra a justifiable measure?—Was it proper to permit six and a-half inches of catheter to remain nine days in the urinary canal without making any attempt to effect the extraction of it? Was it in accordance with sound surgical principles to open the urethra in the perinæum when the broken catheter might have been readily seized and extracted in a few seconds by means of an ordinary urethral forceps, or by one or other of the extracting instruments found in all well-appointed lithotomy cases? You state that the accident which occurred to the patient of Drs. Bowerbank and Anderson was one of no ordinary difficulty; but I would be glad to learn where the difficulty lay. Is it a matter of extraordinary difficulty to manipulate the blades of a urethral forceps in a canal of sufficient calibre to permit the passage of a No. 14 sound, and to seize the shank of a broken catheter lying a few inches distant from the urethral orifice? If so simple an operation cannot be readily executed, the art of surgery must have reached a very low ebb; but neither I nor any of the eight medical witnesses who were examined at Bailey's inquest ventured to endorse or confirm such a view, nor did any of the twelve jurors entertain it. These gentlemen, after a patient inquiry of seven days' duration, unanimously returned a verdict to the effect that Richard Bailey died from improper surgical treatment. Such a verdict is, no doubt, a painful one to those more immediately affected by it, but it was impossible that the jurors could have arrived at any other decision. Nor will Dr. Bowerbank himself be much surprised at it, if he reflects that for the last five or six years he has openly and avowedly ignored the professional qualifications of every medical man who has been connected with the public hospital during the last twenty years. It is curious that in the first month of his hospital incumbency he should have encountered the untoward occurrences which Richard Bailey's death has entailed, and if the verdict which has been recorded upon it have no other good effect, it will at all events have afforded another illustration of the non-perfectibility of human nature, and prove a sufficient exemplification of the operation of retributive justice in the moral government of our planet.

I am, &c.,

ALEX. FIDDES, Fellow of the Royal
College of Surgeons of Edinburgh.

Kingston, Jamaica, April 24.

[* * * The article to which Mr. Fiddes refers was an expression of our unbiassed opinion, formed after a careful examination of the evidence given at the coroner's inquest. Believing a great principle of medical ethics to be at stake, we abstained from sitting in judgment on the surgical treatment pursued in the management of the case. We considered this a question entirely apart from the main one suggested by the whole story. We are quite ready to acknowledge that the treatment of the patient does not receive our entire approval; but any surgical deficiency displayed was only forced into general notice by the fact that it became a party weapon in one of those miserable feuds which more than anything else, injure the profession in the eyes of a keen-sighted public.—ED. M. T.]

To the Editor of the Medical Times and Gazette.

SIR,—In your number of the 27th ultimo is a letter signed "Alex. Fiddes," in which that gentleman attempts to get rid of your just strictures on the conduct of himself and a few members of the profession here, by casting the blame upon me.

As regards "Bailey's case," I shall say no more than what I have already expressed in my evidence at the Coroner's inquest—the more so as my partner, Dr. Anderson, has furnished you with a true and detailed account of this unfortunate case.

For years past, I have done my utmost to reform the gross abuses existing in the public Hospital and Lunatic Asylum of this city, and in doing so, I have had to cross the path of not a few members of the medical profession, and others (contractors for the supplies of these institutions.) I have thus incurred the displeasure and hatred of a party who have hitherto spared no opportunity to malign my character and to thwart my proposed improvements, and some of the most prejudiced and virulent of whom appeared, as jurors or witnesses at the recent inquest.

I have in a great measure succeeded in my object, as may be seen on reference to the recent reports of these institutions, but during the last two years, in my capacity of Chairman of the Board of Visitors of the Public Hospital, I have given great offence to Mr. Alex. Fiddes, one of the Ordinary Medical Officers, who considers that no medical man should be on the Board of Visitors.

I have not your journal of the 27th ult., before me, but I will notice a few of the charges made against me by Mr. Fiddes, from recollection.

The first is, that I have insulted the members of the profession connected with the hospital. The height and depth of my sinning in this respect has been, on witnessing glaring points of mismanagement, to express my opinion "that such arose from the fact, that of all the medical men connected with this institution, not one had been previously a House-Surgeon in a British or any other hospital, and therefore could not understand the management of such an institution in detail. This, though allowed to be true in fact, has nevertheless been voted insulting by the gentlemen concerned.

Mr. Fiddes next charges me, with setting all professional etiquette at defiance. On one occasion, which occurred in 1864, of charges being made by a patient which implicated one of the resident medical officers—these were forwarded by me, as Chairman of the Board of Visitors, *unread*, to the Inspector and Director, to be inquired into by him, but were by him referred back to the Board as too serious to be investigated by him. On this occasion, I was accused by Mr. Fiddes, and a clique of the members of the Board, of being actuated by personal motives against the resident medical officer, and of having acted unprofessionally in not having sent in the charges to be decided by the medical officers themselves. At a meeting of the Board I indignantly repelled this insult, and stated that I had only done my duty, and that in the performance of my public duties I would not allow any nonsensical charges, of so-called breach of professional etiquette, to actuate me, but would act in a straightforward way to all.

I insisted on the charges being fully inquired into, and I certainly did feel shocked and disgusted to hear the medical officers, and Mr. Fiddes in particular, declare that this young man had proved himself since his appointment skilful and unremitting in his attention to his duties, when, to my knowledge, Mr. Fiddes had over and over again, to different persons, when speaking of him, declared him to be "ignorant of his profession," to be "fast," "idle," "the coolest fellow he had ever known for neglecting his duties"—and when I knew, too, that on one occasion the ordinary Medical officers have made serious complaints against him to the Inspector and Director for neglecting the keeping of the registers.

I may add that these very books are now in existence, and afford a present instance of the disgraceful manner in which some of the duties of the office were conducted.

Such are, some of Mr. Alex. Fiddes's charges against me. So true as these are, so true are the rest. But to give you an idea of Mr. Fiddes's truthfulness, integrity of purpose, and consistency of opinion throughout the whole Hospital controversy here, I will give two extracts of his evidence on two separate occasions.

The first was on May 17, 1861, before the commissioners appointed to inquire into the condition and management of the Public Hospital. At this time, I must observe, that Mr. Fiddes had been upwards of twenty years in practice in Kingston, twelve or eighteen months of which, in 1854-55 he had acted as Assistant-Surgeon in the Public Hospital.

At the time of being examined, Dr. Scott being the sole Ordinary Medical Attendant, Mr. Fiddes was an advocate for a greatly increased Medical Staff, and for the different members of the Profession in the city, holding the appointments for a fixed period in rotation.

Mr. Alex. Fiddes on oath: "You are well acquainted with the Public Hospital and Lunatic Asylum?" "I believe I am."

"Do you consider the present site a proper position for a Hospital?" "I do not consider it a proper one, or one that would be chosen in these days for a Hospital."

"Will you give your reasons for considering the site ineligible?"

"That part of the City is more unhealthy than any other part."

"Can you assign a reason for this?"

"It is not exposed to the sea breeze; it is exposed to the north-westerly breeze, which is a malarial breeze, and there would be a difficulty in establishing a drainage."

"Is the locality unhealthy from natural causes irrespective of the presence of the Hospital there?" "I believe so; but both may combine to render it so."

"Are you aware of any swamps being in the locality?" "Yes; there is a rank vegetation north and west, and when it rains a great deal of water falls on the surface; at times the land wind passes over it."

"Are you aware of any swamps or saline exhalations passing over the Hospital?" "In failure of the sea-breeze, and when the variable land-wind prevails, it might prejudicially operate on the locality in which the building is situated."

"Is there any disease which is more prevalent in that quarter than any other part of Kingston?" "There is a great deal of malaria and bowel diseases in that locality, during the rainy seasons, in May and October."

"Have you observed if these diseases are more prevalent in the neighbourhood of the Hospital?" "I have not observed that; it is so generally in that part of the city."

"Is convalescence from disease more delayed in that locality than in other quarters?" "No."

* * * * *

"Have you been an officer in the Public Hospital?" "Yes."

* * * * *

"During that time was there any epidemic disease in the institution?" "Bowel complaint."

"Did you find it increase when the cesspools were being cleaned?" "I did not trace it to any direct cause."

* * * * *

"Have you ever filled the office of House Surgeon in any of the English or Scottish Hospitals?" "No."

* * * * *

"Do you think the mortality in the Hospital greater, *cæteris paribus*, than in the town?" "I do not think so. The mortality in the Institution is high, but it should not in my opinion, be considered that this is the consequence of the want of Surgical skill. The locality of the Hospital, with the swamps and malaria, must lead to a high mortality."

Strange to say, Dr. Andrew Dunn, who was present, and heard Mr. Fiddes's evidence, fully concurred with it.

I will here only observe that the swamps and malaria have been in no way diminished—the sea or day, and the land or night breezes still alternate as heretofore.

On November 9, 1863, the following is the evidence of Mr. Fiddes as taken before the Committee of the House of Assembly. At this time Dr. Scott had been dismissed, and Mr. Alex. Fiddes was one of the ordinary Medical attendants of the Public Hospital, and as such, had modified his opinions on several subjects: he now strenuously opposed any increase of the Medical Staff, and urged upon

the Board of Visitors that the appointments of Medical officers for a limited time, and in rotation, would not be conducive to the well-fare of the Institution, and recommended that the present appointments should be made permanent.

“ Mr. Alex. Fiddes, on oath, stated : I am one of the Medical officers of the Public Hospital. I think its situation is just as healthy as the other parts of the city, certainly more so than the lower part of the western end. I do not think there is more intermittent fever in that district than any other. There is fever when the westerly winds prevail ; these are not frequent. The ground is gravelly and dry, and the water flows off readily. The present situation is relatively as good as the Court-House would be.”

“ Have you altered the opinions you expressed before the Commissioners, as to the healthiness of the site of the Public Hospital ? ”

“ My increased experience of the Hospital itself and its immediate locality, since the time that my evidence was given before the Commissioners, has somewhat modified my views in regard to the salubrity of its site. I certainly do not think that the site of the Hospital can be called an unhealthy one, and the present Medical officers of the city, in a recent communication which I had with them on the subject, assured me that they had less sickness in that neighbourhood than in the lower part of the town.”

Strange to say, Dr. Andrew Dunn, now attached to the Hospital, also gave evidence, and concurred in all respects with Dr. Fiddes.

Subsequently, in the last annual report of the Public Hospital, these gentlemen, instead of attributing the diminished mortality of the institution to its true causes—namely, a diminished daily number of inmates, the power of selecting cases applying for admission, and the existence of a severe epidemic of small pox, cases of which were not received into the wards of the institution—twice state “ that the lessened mortality is a proof that the averment as to the unhealthiness of the site of the Hospital is groundless.”

On this report, being submitted to the Board of Visitors, previous to its being presented to the Legislature, I pointed out to the Board that such a statement was not concurred in by myself and other members of the Board, whose formerly expressed opinions as to the unhealthiness of the Hospital, were still unchanged, and that such a bold assertion was calculated to mislead the Government. I therefore, moved the following remark, which was unanimously adopted, and ordered to be appended to the report :—“ The Board, however, cannot abstain from taking notice, of the statement that the diminished rate of mortality ‘ affords irrefragable proof and shows conclusively that the condemnatory averments which have been made against the salubrity of the Kingston Hospital are groundless.’ Such comments upon opinions previously expressed are, in the opinion of this Board, inappropriate and irrelevant in a statement prepared for the Legislature, and the Board dissent from the views on this subject expressed in the report.”

This dissent of the Board—together with a report from the Inspector and Director, relative to the dietary of the Institution, and the fact that His Excellency the Governor called upon Dr. Dunn, as

Senior Ordinary Medical Officer, according to law, to retire at the end of the year—appeared to annoy Mr. Fiddes, who thereupon resigned his appointment. The Government were thus unexpectedly placed in a difficulty, and requested me to assume the appointment as one of the Ordinary Medical Officers, in Mr Fiddes's place. This I did with great inconvenience to myself, and under the express stipulation that I should be relieved at as early a period as practicable.

Up to this latter occurrence, Mr. Fiddes always appeared on friendly terms with me, and never on one single occasion gave me reason to believe, that he entertained towards me the sentiments he has since expressed.

I would here express my belief, that Mr. Fiddes's resignation of his post as a Medical Officer of the Hospital, on the plea of vindicating the rights of his profession, is absurd, and I have strong reasons for thinking that he has deceived himself as to his real motives.

With respect to his letter, as published in the *Medical Times and Gazette* I will only further assure your readers, that it is an unscrupulous repetition of assertions which he first published in Jamaica, and which, with the exception of a few lines in which I publicly denied their correctness, I have been content hitherto to regard with indifference, feeling that his motives are generally understood, and that I have the approval and confidence of the Government, the great body of the profession, and by far the greater majority of the community.

That such conduct as was exhibited at the inquest, is disgraceful and degrading to the Medical Profession, must have been apparent to every impartial mind; and you are indebted to the thanks of all who would uphold the dignity and respectability of our profession, for the severe but well-merited remarks which have called forth Mr. Fiddes's letter.

I am, &c.,

LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK.

Kingston, Jamaica, June 24, 1865.

[** Having now allowed both the opposed parties, to make a statements in our columns, we shall publish nothing further respecting this controversy. The opinion we expressed as to the evidence given by certain of the Medical witnesses at the inquest in our article "Colonial Medical Ethics" remains unaltered.—ED. M. T.]

To the Editor of the Colonial Standard.

SIR,—My attention has been directed to a letter in the *Medical Times* of the 29th July last, signed Lewis Quier Bowerbank, and couched in this gentleman's usual style of misrepresentation and insinuation. In the said letter, I find Dr. Bowerbank again doing his utmost to vilify and abuse myself, and taking great pains to convince the Editor of the *Medical Times*, and his readers, that nobody in Jamaica but himself has any competency to carry out the higher and more important professional duties of a Public Hospital. Dur-

ing the several years that Dr. Bowerbank has been occupied in an endeavour to overthrow me, I have always treated his hostile efforts with indifference, feeling satisfied in my own mind, that all his essays in this direction, were only exemplifications of the viper gnawing at the file; and I would have been content to let his latest explosion in the *Medical Times* pass by unnoticed, were it not for the fact, that in this letter he has endeavoured to injure a young member of the profession in Kingston, who, I feel assured, never did him any harm. In justice to this gentleman, I am compelled to take public notice of the aspersions which Dr. Bowerbank has cast upon his professional character.

Dr. Bowerbank, alluding to certain charges which were at one time preferred by a patient in the hospital against Dr. Stern, one of the Resident Medical Officers says:—

“I insisted on the charges being fully enquired into; and I certainly did feel shocked and disgusted to hear the medical officers, and Mr. Fiddes in particular, declare that this young man had proved himself, since his appointment, skilful and unremitting in his attention to his duties, when, to my knowledge, Mr. Fiddes had over and over again, to different persons, when speaking of him, declared him ‘to be ignorant of his profession,’ to be ‘fast,’ ‘idle,’ ‘the coolest fellow he had ever known for neglecting his duties;’ and when I knew, too, that on one occasion the Ordinary Medical Officers have made serious complaints against him, to the Inspector and Director, for neglecting the keeping of the Registers.” I have to observe, that when Dr. Bowerbank penned these lines, with the view of hurting and damaging a young professional brother, at the very outset of his career, he knew right well that what he stated was utterly untrue. So far was I from speaking disparagingly of Dr. Stern’s habits or professional capabilities, that but very shortly previous to the period to which Dr. Bowerbank alludes, I wrote to London, for a case of amputating instruments, of the value of eleven guineas, which I presented to him (Dr. Stern), in token of my appreciation of his excellent conduct and professional attainments, whilst acting as one of the House Surgeons.

This testimonial, which is still in Dr. Stern’s possession, bears the following superscription written by myself:

“PRESENTED BY

“ALEXANDER FIDDES, F.R.C. S., Edin.,

“TO

“MORITZ STERN, M.R.C.S., Lon.

“In Testimony of his meritorious conduct while acting as Assistant Surgeon to the Public Hospital, Jamaica, in the year 1862.”

So much for my animus and ill feeling towards Dr. Stern.

With regard to Dr. Bowerbank’s statement that I had been obliged to censure Dr. Stern for not keeping the Register duly written up, I have also to observe, that this statement is utterly untrue—in fact, I and my colleague, Dr. Dunn, were necessitated to write to

his Excellency the Governor, complaining of the unwarranted statement which Dr. Bowerbank had made in reference to the Register, and mentioning that since our connection with the Public Hospital, the Register had never been behind. The Governor himself was quite satisfied about this, and wrote in a despatch to Dr. Dunn and myself, that he readily withdrew all the censures which he had previously passed on Dr. Stern, in the matter of the Register, through Dr. Bowerbank's communication with him on the subject.

The recent attempt which Dr. Bowerbank has made to re-assert these wilful misstatements is discreditable to him, both as a gentleman and a professional man, and is calculated to convey a very poor opinion of his probity and veracity; and I have no hesitation in saying, that his discreditable and cowardly endeavour to injure Dr. Stern by misrepresentations of this kind, is a cold-blooded, heartless act—an act which could only originate with an individual in whom the elements of the Demon are generally in excess over those of the Angel. In all my hospital controversies with Dr. Bowerbank, what I most bitterly and loudly complained of, was this gentleman's utter disregard for the sanctity of truth, and I regret to say that in this respect he has in no way changed for the better. Considering that his career as an assumed Hospital Reformer, is now near at an end, viewing the painful and humiliating position in which he now stands self accused before the Coroner's court, I will not now press too heavily upon him, but will leave him for the present in the hands of his religious advisers, who I hope may be yet able to convert him into a very good man, if they can only succeed in eradicating from his mind that deep rooted idiosyncrasy which he has always displayed to injure and degrade his professional brethren with the view of effecting his own exaltation,

I am, your obdt. servant,

ALEX. FIDDES.

Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons,
of Edinburgh.

Kingston, 23rd August, 1865.

"LITERÆ SCRIPTÆ MANENT."

REPLY OF DR. BOWERBANK TO MR. FIDDES,
ON THE FOREGOING CORRESPONDENCE.

To Alexander Fiddes, F.R.C.S.

Sir,—Since I first met you now some twenty years ago—up to the 23rd January last—you always led me, and our mutual friends in Europe, and as far as I can understand persons known to both of us out here, to believe that we were on friendly terms—and within a week or two of the above named day we happened to meet in the Board Room of the Hospital—you in your capacity as one of the ordinary Medical officers, and I as the chairman of the Board of Visitors. The late Inspector and Director, Mr. Trench, was present. On this occasion, the following conversation took place, after shaking hands. I said “Well Fiddes I am sorry to hear you have resigned your appointment as ordinary Medical officer of the Hospital; and the more so, as some of the newspapers state that you have been forced to do so in consequence of my improper and overbearing conduct.” To this you replied “I do not write in the newspapers.” I then observed “no more do I, but as regards my conduct as a visitor of the Hospital I am conscious of only having done my duty; and if in the performance of that, I have caused you any offence, would it not be more honorable and manly in you to tell me so to my face, than to make complaints behind my back—” To this you made no reply, but after a short while left the room, uttering your usual leave-taking “so long.”

Your explanation of, or excuse for such conduct, as given in your letter of the date of the 25th January, is certainly very unsatisfactory and evasive, “as to my alledged want of candour and manliness in never having expressed my sentiments to Dr. Bowerbank personally, and in having remained silent when invited to state my reasons for resigning my Hospital appointment, anybody who has taken or who may take the trouble to read through my letter, will see that I have been by no means backward in giving utterance to my sentiments, and they will also perceive from the correspondence contained in the said letter, that I officially conveyed to Government in language as plain and intelligible as I could find, my principal reasons for not remaining longer as one of the Medical officers of the Public Hospital.”

After reading this, I repeat that on no single occasion did you ever lead me to suppose that you entertained unfriendly feelings towards me, much less that you considered me a “dangerous man,” or a “Mephistopheles,” (both very harmless titles as coming from “Alexander Fiddes.”)

“Odia in longum jaciens, quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret.”

TACITUS.

Which being translated

“A man who lays his resentment aside, but stores it up to bring

it forward with additional acrimony." This, as Junius observes, is a description of the very worst of characters. The man who can dissemble his resentment until occasion serves, is the basest of all hypocrites, and the most dangerous of all enemies."

Surely you do not suppose that I perused all the Hospital documents forwarded to the Government, or that, till I read your letter of the 23rd January, 1865, I had ever seen or heard of your correspondence with the Governor in Executive Committee; if you do I can assure you, you are mistaken.

Most assuredly, when we parted in the consulting room of the Hospital, I did not think we had then ceased to be friends. I did not imagine, that we had "come to a rupture." Nay, so far from this, on the morning of Saturday, the 21st January, when driving a friend along East Queen Street, I met you also driving; I drew up and mentioned to you that a patient of yours had met with an accident, and had been seen by my partner Dr. Anderson, and required your early attendance. You thanked me in your usual manner.

On the morning of Monday, the 23rd January, 1865, a letter from you to the Editor of the "Colonial Standard," was published in that paper, a perusal of which I must confess, surprised me. On reading it over, I was struck with the dishonest and disingenuous spirit pervading it, and I immediately answered it in a letter to the Editor of the same journal, and to which you replied the next day. These three letters appear in the correspondence.

Had it not been that I had accepted office under the Government, and thus bound myself by the interdiction of the Governor and Secretary of State not to write in the public newspapers of the island, I should ere this, have noticed your communications in detail, and have proved the majority of your statements false, as I asserted them to be in my note of the 24th January.

You can readily understand my silence and inaction, as in the last paragraph of your note of the 25th January, you write "I have to observe that my official connection with the Hospital did not terminate till the 20th, and up to that period my hands were tied with regard to making any public hostile criticism on Hospital proceedings."

I certainly think that as you were actuated by these feelings, you should have extended something of the same kind to me. I do not consider that you have shown any great feeling of generosity or gallant bearing towards me, in attacking me in the newspapers two days after I took office under the Government, (my hands were tied on the 21st January,) but not only have you attacked me by letters signed by yourself, but if you have not also written anonymously, you have supplied materiel to some of the editors of papers for false and slanderous editorials aimed at Dr. Anderson and myself.

Having now 30th September, 1865, ceased my connection with the Public Hospital in accordance with the arrangements under which I took office, (I need not inform you that this is the termination of the financial year,) and being desirous of shortly visiting Europe for a few months, I lose no time in addressing you, and in accepting your

challenge as conveyed in your letter of the 25th January, and which you inform us "is based almost entirely on documentary testimony, and I challenge Dr. Bowerbank to lay his finger on a single sentence of it which is not strictly in accordance with truth," and I doubt not you extend your challenge also to the subsequent correspondence, which has taken place in the pages of the "Medical Times and Gazette," as also in the "Colonial Standard," and I mistake greatly, if I do not prove the great majority of your statements to be "not strictly in accordance with truth," and your veracity worthless.

With regard to your letter of the 23rd January, you commence by stating that several of your friends had requested you to lay before the public a statement of the circumstances which led to your resignation of the office you recently held in the Public Hospital, and you profess your intention of doing so. You state "It has been alledged that I was induced to tender my resignation of office in consequence of the recent alterations or changes which the Governor has thought fit to make with regard to the periodical retirement of the Medical officers, and that my inability to remain in the Hospital as a permanent member of the Medical Staff, is the principal cause of my resignation of office. But such is not the case."

In spite of this denial however, you in a subsequent portion of your letter allow that this was the cause of your resignation, "I being fully cognizant of all the movements of the game, and perceiving that my means of self defence would be materially diminished by Dr. Dunn's retirement, *I had no alternative but to resign my office.*"

It would not be difficult for me to adduce proof that while drawing up the Report of the 21st November, 1864, you stated that you had made up your mind to resign your office in the Hospital, as it took up too much of your time, and that for some time past, you have talked of giving up the practice of your profession, and retiring to another part of the island.

Your remark that the Governor thought fit to make certain changes or alterations, is calculated and I doubt not intended to mislead. The periodical retirement of the Medical officers both Ordinary and Resident, is distinctly provided for in the Act XXVI Victoria, Cap. 4, regulating this Institution. As regards the ordinary Medical officers the 10th clause enacts:

"The Governor shall have power from time to time to appoint, and at pleasure to remove, not exceeding three ordinary Medical officers, at salaries not exceeding in the whole the sum of Three Hundred and Sixty Pounds per annum, among whom the wards and patients shall be divided as equally as practicable, and one of whom shall retire annually from office, as may be arranged by the rules and regulations to be made as aforesaid."

This Act passed the Legislature on the 12th December, 1862, and any delay which occurred in carrying out this provision of the Law, can only be attributed to you, as when the Board of Visitors at a meeting on the 11th August, 1863, were considering the proposed rules of the Institution, you strongly recommended that the prescribed rules for this clause of the Act, should not be framed, as you did not think the retirement of the ordinary Medical officers would be conducive to the welfare of the Institution. The majority of the

Board acted on your advice, and the rule was not drawn up. (See Minutes.)

Discovering the omission, His Excellency the Governor subsequently wrote to the Inspector, requesting that in accordance with the act, such a rule might be drawn up. That officer applied to the ordinary Medical officers to frame it, but they (you and Dr. Dunn,) replied in a hypocritical letter, that it would be indelicate for you to draw up such a rule, as it affected yourselves. The Governor then called upon the Board of Visitors to carry out the requirements of the Law, which they did, and upon this His Excellency acted when he called on Dr. Dunn, as the ordinary medical officer longest connected with the Hospital, to retire; and in consequence of which act as you yourself have stated, you "resigned, having no alternative but to do so."

Let me ask you where was the delicacy of Dr. Dunn and yourself when you both urged upon the Board of Visitors not to frame the required rule in the first instance. I need not remind you that it was yourself, when Dr. Scott was the chief Medical officer of the Hospital, and you were unconnected with it, who drew up the petition to the Legislature, and who then advocated the periodical retirement of the ordinary Medical officers. You must recollect that that petition was signed by some 1300 persons.

Such inconsistencies of conduct, such veering of opinions, are contemptible and suspicious. You then proceed, "but in order to show this more clearly, it is necessary that I should enumerate somewhat in detail the circumstances which first led to my official connection with the institution."

You then allude to the vacancy of Consulting Surgeon created by Dr. Magrath's death in 1858, and evidently intend it to be understood, that if you had chosen, you would have been elected to the office. Here, I think you reckon without your host, at any rate you have concealed the truth. It would have been more honest if you had gone back to the year 1853, and told the public, how when I came from Spanish Town to reside in Kingston, your then partner Dr. Paton and yourself proposed to me to co-operate with you to obtain if possible a radical reform as to the management of the Public Hospital; to throw it open to the profession—you might have mentioned, how I got Mr. William Girod, then a member of the House of Assembly, to take up the subject and to move for a Committee of the House.

You might have told how yourself and myself went up together and gave evidence before such Committee, and which evidence is published in the Votes of Assembly for 1853-54. You might have stated how our movement was resisted by the then Commissioners of the Hospital, and how it displeased Drs. Magrath and Scott—the then medical officers—and how during the next session, to put an end to the efforts at Reform, a Bill was smuggled in, creating a new office of Assistant House Surgeon, who was to live in or near the institution—how this was a mere sop to silence, or buy you over—and which you swallowed—it being arranged that you might live where you liked. Yes, Sir, you might then have told how, when I remonstrated with you for forsaking your friends and frustrating all our

efforts at reform, your partner and yourself insulted me by insinuating that I wanted the beggarly office for myself. No, Sir, I would never have held such an office as that. You might then have gone on and stated how dissatisfied you became—and how you expressed your disappointment and declared that you would never again serve under Dr. Scott; how at last you resigned the appointment, and soon after went to England, in the hope of not returning, and how this vacant office was not again filled up.

This information, Sir, is necessary, before you allude to what took place after Dr. Magrath's death.

You are quite right in stating "that when the vacancy occurred, I became a candidate for the appointment of Consulting Surgeon."—As I have fully explained in my pamphlet published at that time, I did so knowing I stood no chance of being elected, as the majority of the Commissioners had already resolved to appoint Dr. Scott to be the medical officer.

I am well aware that two or three Commissioners did apply to you to offer yourself, but that you declined, and I knew well, that your reason was, that you would not serve with Dr. Scott again, besides you could hardly have been appointed to the vacant office as you were junior in the profession to Dr. Scott.

You state you are not aware that any one opposed me—you know well that both Dr. Scott and Dr. Dunn did.

You then add "from the moment of his rejection Dr. Bowerbank commenced his famous hospital campaign, which after a duration of four years was temporarily suspended but not terminated, by the removal of Dr. Scott from his office of Principal Medical Officer of the hospital."

You know this statement to be untrue. I had commenced before the vacancy occurred, as I have stated in my pamphlets. You call this a "famous campaign"—so it has been for me, it has been a signal instance of truth, courage and perseverance, overcoming deceit, cowardice, and abuse of power. You yourself have, and are now occupying a conspicuous position in this protracted campaign, and if you are not more careful, the part you are enacting will prove you "*infamous*."

With regard to your appointment by Governor Darling at the time of his proposal to you, you state "I had become so disgusted at the discreditable manner in which the hospital controversy had been conducted, that I felt no desire whatever to form any official connection with the institution." Doubtless you were disgusted with it, but I hesitate not to say that if it was discreditable, it was you and your conduct that rendered it so. Your ferocious and ungentlemanly onslaught in the public papers on Governor Darling, was disgraceful, and among right thinking men damaged the hospital cause; and your miserable unwilling evidence, and convenient memory in the different trials in the Courts of Kingston, and before the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the management of the Public Hospital and Lunatic Asylum, sickened every one and convinced every honest man that you were coquetting with both parties.

Let any one contrast your evidence as given on these occasions, with your recent evidence in your Bailey and Bell Inquests—the one meagre, unwilling, and *pumped*; the others full, flowing, and welling out.

You next state “and this feeling on my part seems to have been pretty well understood, for early in the morning of the 21st March, the day after I had received Governor Darling’s letter, Dr. Bowerbank and Dr. Campbell called upon me at my residence, and urged upon me the propriety of stepping forward and occupying the vacant post in the hospital.” Here, Sir, you state a fact, and tell the truth, as regards Dr. Campbell and myself visiting you; but your inference as to why we did so, is not quite correct. We knew, now that Dr. Scott was dismissed, your previous objection did not exist. We knew what Governor Darling’s plans were, with regard to the hospital—we knew that after giving one appointment to Dr. Dunn, if you refused the other he had decided what to do, and we, not considering these plans conducive to the welfare of the Institution, did call upon you—for then I hesitate not to say, I did consider you a gentleman, and a good operative Surgeon, and I thought your appointment would be advantageous to the Institution—and for these reasons, we did advise you to accept the appointment offered you by Governor Darling—but I confess I was surprised by Dr. Dunn and yourself accepting office at the hands of a man you had insulted and abused.

Governor Darling was a man of the world, and an astute Governor, he had heard of your character—of your weakness—he had watched your actions—to suit his own purposes he offered you the bait—and you pocketing your principles, &c., swallowed it. You were a convenient tool, and as such you were made use of for the good of the Public Hospital.

You had a personal interview with Governor Darling as you say—and that far-seeing gentleman will I believe, never forget that interview; your entrance into his chamber of audience will never be effaced from his memory—nor will he be likely, to forget how a savage and ferocious newspaper denouncer and slanderer, by the manner of a gentleman and the finesse of a politician, was won and cajoled by a little “soft-sawder,” flattery and condescension.

You next proceed, “Towards the end of that year, a new Hospital Bill was passed by the Legislature, and came into force early in 1863; this bill was drawn up by Dr. Bowerbank, by direction of Governor Eyre and his then Executive Committee.”

Here you are in error, the Hospital bill was originally drawn up by myself—not in the time of Mr. Eyre, but of Governor Darling, and by the request of his Executive Committee.

No formality “of showing you the bill was gone through prior to its final reading.”

Previous to drawing up the draft of a bill I had several conversations with you, and upon the strength of them I drew up a bill in the rough, which was placed in your hands, and which you showed to Dr. Dunn. I explained to you fully the anomalies, so called, that Governor Darling insisted on, namely, the retention of the office of Inspector and Director, and the retirement of the Resident Medical

Officers in rotation, as had been suggested by Sir Henry Barkly—I then showed you that I had introduced all the suggestions which had emanated from, or been agreed to by yourself, especially the increase of the Medical Staff, and the periodical retirement of the Ordinary Medical Officers, which was then quite your hobby, as the practice pursued in Edinburgh; and in furtherance of which you yourself drew up a petition to the Legislature as I have already stated, which was signed by some 1300 persons.

You assert “I suggested some six or seven alterations, but as I had reason to anticipate, not one of my suggestions, was carried into effect,” I declare this to be thoroughly false, and I doubt not Dr. Charles Campbell, if present, could bear me out.

After seeing you, and getting back from you the draft of the bill, I requested the members of the profession to meet one evening at my house, for the purpose of going over the clauses, which they did—but neither Dr. Dunn nor yourself attended, as you had promised to do. This bill was lost, the House when in committee on it having been counted out. The next Session when under Governor Eyre’s direction, another bill founded on this same one, was drawn up by Dr. Hamilton and myself—that also was shown to you, and you made no suggestions, nor objections—this passed the Legislature.

After its passing, in an interview I had with Governor Eyre, he offered me the appointment of consulting physician. This I refused, feeling that holding this office together with that of a member of the Board of Visitors, which I was, *ex officio*, as Custos of Kingston, I might be brought into collision with the Medical Staff. His Excellency then did me the honor to ask my advice as to whom he should appoint as the Ordinary Medical Officers—I recommended that the then officers should be continued.

That same day his Excellency sent for you; in fact, I brought over his note to you, requesting you to go over to Spanish Town the next day—and in spite of your assertions, your alleged qualms and difficulties were soon dispelled and quieted, and you re-accepted office.

It is not for me at this part of your letter, to respond to your insulting and cowardly language to the Governor, but I have no hesitation in telling you that it disgraces you as a man, as a Christian, as a gentleman, as a member of the Medical Profession, and as one holding a Commission of the Peace under him, as her Majesty’s Representative.

You now, Sir, I am grieved to say, are guilty of gross untruth and slander, in stating—“Early in May 1863, I found Dr. Bowerbank (who had been elected to the office of Chairman of the Board of Visitors under the new law) engaged in fanning the flames of a Hospital conspiracy, got up with the special object of crushing one of the Resident Medical Officers. True it is, that I found this honorable straight-forward gentleman maintaining a correspondence with the individual who had initiated the conspiracy, supplying him with writing materials, and otherwise inciting him to prosecute his charges, without myself being in any way informed of the existence of any complaint, although I was for several hours daily in the

wards of the hospital, and was accessible to any patient, who might have grievances to urge." I repeat, the above is untruthful—a downright falsehood—not supported "by documentary evidence," but by the same distinctly refuted.

Why I, as Chairman of the Board of Visitors should make known to one of the Ordinary Medical Officers any charge made to me by a patient I have yet to learn. At that time, I was daily in the habit of coming from Spanish Town in the morning, and going back at three o'clock to attend the House of Assembly. I therefore had but little spare time. I acquainted both Dr. Somerville and Dr. Stern of the fact of my having had complaints sent to me, because I happened to meet them—and I also acquainted the Inspector and Director—and I dare say, if I had happened to meet Dr. Dunn or yourself, I should have informed you as an act of courtesy—not of duty or right.

The real facts of the case you allude to, are set forth in a statement I felt it to be my duty to make to the Board of Visitors, in consequence of certain members of the Board, and the Medical Staff taking upon themselves to charge me with being actuated by personal motives towards Dr. Stern. As the statement is a long one, I will annex it to this communication as Appendix No. 1. As you and the other Medical officers were present at each meeting, you heard me make the greater portion of the statement orally—and you also heard it read to the Board.

The idea of my wishing to crush one of the Resident Medical officers was certainly absurd and false. I knew this young gentleman before he began to study medicine, and most assuredly had no reason to dislike him, though from your own expressed opinions of him as a student and licenced medical practitioner, I might have distrusted his efficiency to fill the office he did. This young gentleman had in no way crossed my path or lowered my dignity, or deserved my enmity. That he had acted indiscreetly on one or two occasions towards me I will allow; but on these occasions I bore with him on account of his youth and inexperience, and was amused rather than annoyed at his display of innocent but bumptious conceit, or as you term it "*mannerism*."

A special meeting of the Board of Visitors was called on the 6th May 1863, to consider certain complaints of a patient of the name of Alan McCrea. Before entering into the case, objections were taken to the proceedings as irregular; these were overruled, and the business of the meeting was proceeded with. During this meeting, a letter signed by Dr. Dunn and yourself, was presented by the Inspector and Director, bearing date 6th May. "This was received and directed to be laid on the table until the close of the investigation." This letter appears in your communication of the 23rd January to the "*Colonial Standard*." It is a pity that in introducing this document, you did not add to it the opinion of his Excellency the Governor, as it stands in the Minute Book of the hospital, which is as follows "I do not see anything irregular in the course taken by Dr. Bowerbank. On the 29th April he received a letter, dated the previous day, from a patient, stating that he had complaints to make and wished to see him personally. He went and

told the patient, the complaints must be made in writing, and caused him to be supplied with materials. On the evening of the 1st May the patient sent in his written complaints to Dr. Bowerbank; who on the following day, very properly sent them at once to the Inspector and Director to be enquired into. The Inspector and Director preferred calling upon the Board of Visitors to make the investigation rather than do it himself, and in this preference the medical men of the institution concurred.

“(Signed) E. EYRE.”

3rd July, 1863.

At the next adjourned meeting of the Board of Visitors on the 11th May, the minutes have it, “Some objections were made to the phraseology used in the letter from the Ordinary Medical Officers,” and an attempt was made to withdraw it and substitute another, the Board refused this offer as irregular.

I was not at all surprised at the attempt made to retract this letter—its arrogant and dictatorial style was certainly insulting, and in the third paragraph there is a distinct untruth, a deliberate falsehood, which at the time of its being read was pointed out to the writers of it, Drs. Dunn and yourself, by myself, by the Inspector and some of the members of the Board, it was this, “the subject of McRae’s complaints was initiated and carried to where it now stands without reference to either of the Ordinary Medical Officers, or the Inspector and Director.”

How then, Sir, have you presumed to publish this letter and to reiterate this falsehood? In a subsequent part of your communication you write “and I trust that the explanation which I have given will further secure for me the approbation of the public.” Do you Sir, think a discerning public will thus tolerate your untruthfulness and will allow you to mock them by such wicked and disreputable conduct?

You next state “The Board of Visitors sat for *seven consecutive days* to investigate the subject of this inquiry.” Here again you are in error. You are wilfully trying to mislead the public.—The first special meeting was held on the 6th May, and by adjournment on the 11th, 15th, 20th, and 28th May and on the 3rd and 11th June, 1863. How do you make these out to be consecutive days? No, Sir, your object is evident; but this adds to your “untruthful sentences.”

At a meeting held on the 20th May, a letter from yourself was presented by the Inspector, it was read and ordered to lie on the table. A copy of this letter you have also included in your communication of the 23rd January. Here you show a great desire to arrogate to yourself the sole management of the hospital, a trust which I, as a visitor of the institution, from past experience, as in Dr. Jobern’s case, would have been most unwilling to confide to you.

In publishing this letter, it is a pity you did not also insert the document in the minute bearing upon it, which is as follows:

“Theoretically the course Dr. Fiddes advises may be the best, but practically, he must take into consideration the low intelligence of a large number of patients, who are admitted into a West Indian

Hospital. It would probably be a good plan to print cards and hang them up in the institution pointing out the course to be adopted by persons having complaints to make ; but I do not think that any rule should debar them from doing so to the Governor or the Official Visitors, who as a matter of course, would forward such complaints as Dr. Bowerbank did, to the Inspector and Director.

“ (Signed)

EDW. EYRE.”

With regard to the course pointed out in your letter to be pursued, I can only say, that if adopted I should consider it highly objectionable, and liable to gross abuse and irregularities, as witness your conduct in Dr. Jobern's case, already alluded to.

From the manner in which you express yourself, one would infer that Dr. Bowerbank (the Chairman), his Lordship the Bishop, the Rector of Kingston (the Rev. D. H. Campbell), the Rev. Mr. Edmondson, the principal medical officer of H. M. Army (Dr. O'Flaherty) the principal medical officer of H. M. Navy (Dr. Mason, the honorable George Solomon and Charles Levy, Esquire, attended “*always*,” i. e. that these gentlemen all and each were present at every meeting—“*on the seven consecutive days* :” this they were not, and here again is an attempt to mislead the public.

At the first meeting on the 6th May, the minutes state that there were present, Dr. Bowerbank, honorable George Solomon, Rev. Jonathan Edmondson, Dr. Mason, and Charles Levy, Esq.

At the second meeting on the 11th May, there were present, Dr. Bowerbank, Rev. Jonathan Edmondson, Rev. D. H. Campbell, his Lordship the Bishop, Dr. Mason and Charles Levy, Esquire.

At the third meeting on the 15th May, there were present, Dr. Bowerbank, Rev. Jonathan Edmondson, Rev. D. H. Campbell, honorable George Solomon, Dr. O'Flaherty and Charles Levy, Esq.

At the fourth meeting, on the 20th May, there were present Dr. Bowerbank, honble. Geo. Solomon, Revd. Jonathan Edmondson, Dr. O'Flaherty, Dr. Mason and Charles Levy, Esq.

At the fifth meeting, on the 28th May, there were present Dr. Bowerbank, Revd. Jonathan Edmondson, Revd. D. H. Campbell, Dr. Mason and Charles Levy, Esq.

At the sixth meeting, on the 3rd June, there were present Dr. Bowerbank, Revd. Jonathan Edmondson, Revd. D. H. Campbell, honble. Geo. Solomon, the Bishop of Kingston, Dr. O'Flaherty, Dr. Mason, and Charles Levy, Esq.

At the seventh meeting, on the 11th June, there were present, Dr. Bowerbank, Revd. D. H. Campbell, Revd. Jonathan Edmondson, honble. Geo. Solomon, and Dr. Mason.

It will thus be seen that the only two who were always present, were myself and the Revd. Mr. Edmondson.

You next allude to the Report which was drawn up by a Committee, and presented to the Board at its meeting on the 11th June, and here, alluding to your statement of the members who you state were always present, you write “these gentlemen framed a Report in which they unanimously agreed” Here again you are in error, I have already stated who were present on the day in question—and

on reference to the minutes I find the following note " Mr. Charles Levy here entered and took his seat, but declined to take any part in the adoption of the Report, and after a few minutes retired."

I will annex this Report as Appendix, No. 2.

You allude also to my dissent from such Report, and to my furnishing a Report of my own—this I also annex as Appendix, No. 3.

Your remarks as to the same, appear to me to be arrogant and presumptuous, and unworthy of any further notice from me.

I may observe here, that my reason for drawing up this Report was, that it appeared to me that the Board of Visitors were not sufficiently acquainted with Hospital matters—or at any rate with the customs of the Kingston Hospital, to understand the merits of the case, and I was annoyed at the determination of yourself and some of the members of the Board of Visitors, to try and persuade the other members of the Board that the whole affair was personal on my part; and lastly, I was struck by the very conspicuous and prominent part you took (being present by permission) to bias and mislead those members of the Board, you could, by bold and rash assertions. I felt that justice was not being done, that an attempt was being made to give the go-bye to the charges and "let down gently the accused." I therefore determined to dissent and to put in my own Report—I did so, it was received by the Board and sent up to the Governor. I also annex the Reply of His Excellency the Governor to these two Reports, as Appendix, No. 4.

You next allude to a communication from Dr. Dunn and yourself to the Governor, requesting a copy of my Report, and you appear to imply that His Excellency had some sinister reason for withholding the same. It appears to me that it is the privilege of the Board of Visitors to communicate with the Governor if they think proper, quite irrespective of the Medical officers or even of the Inspector and Director, and in my opinion the demand from the Medical officers to the Governor, to be furnished with a copy of my letter, was a piece of impertinent assumption on their part, and that a copy being sent, was a concession that they were not entitled to.

You state that on obtaining this document you "discovered in it so many misstatements and palpable untruths, that we were compelled to write plainly with regard to its spurious character." This of course was the opinion of Dr. Dunn and yourself. His Excellency on the receipt of this communication, sent down a copy of a letter to Dr. Stern, withdrawing a censure passed upon him with reference to the Journals; as also extracts from your letter to the Inspector and Director, both of which I here annex as Appendix, No. 5; and it is stated on the minutes, "that on these extracts being read to the Board, Dr. Bowerbank entered his dissent to the statement of the ordinary Medical officers, as concerned the Journals of the Institution."

I will also annex your letter in its entirety as Appendix, No. 6.

Instead of the Medical officers, after their letter had been so treated as it was by the Governor—mutilated, eviscerated and deprived of its venom and stinging apparatus, coquetting to resign, I think that they would have acted a more independent part had they thrown up their appointments there and then. For them after all the

insults they represent they had suffered from May, 1863, to keep office till the one was dismissed from his office by effluxion of time, and the other was left no alternative but to resign in January, 1865, says but little for the principle they talk of sacrificing, and for their duty to the profession—All this to me, from my personal knowledge of Dr. Dunn and yourself is balderdash and twaddle—akin to your miserable effort to persuade the public that you and your “followers” are actuated in all your dirty work, by a feeling of sympathy for suffering humanity. Away with such hypocrisy! We judge men by their actions and not by their words—and in judging a man by his actions, we weigh him in the balance!

To your followers I would quote from Horace :—

“O, imitatores! servum pecus!”

But why, let me ask you, have you omitted to insert this your third letter in your communication to the “Colonial Standard,” of the date of the 23rd January. Why insert two of your letters and not this one, the third and last? Were you ashamed of it? you know well that your two first letters were on the minute book—this your third is not.

You then state, that your letter to the Governor caused him to alter his mind, and induced him to cancel and withdraw certain censures he had previously passed upon certain officers (mark the plural) of the Hospital on the strength of Dr. Bowerbank’s *ex parte statements*,

The “*ex parte statements*” were mostly, if not altogether spoken openly before the Board, face to face, with every man present. They were then written out and read to them, adopted by them, and by their fiat they appear on the face of the minutes. It is a pity that those letters you allude to as causing the Governor to remove the censure, on certain officers, with the exception of that to Dr. Stern about the Register, do not also appear—do not form a part of the documentary evidence—it is a pity indeed, you have not given copies of them in your several communications.

It is possible that his Excellency was misled by the bold assertions contained in this paragraph of your letter. “The statement of Dr. Bowerbank is not correct (that the Hospital Register was not written up, and that he, McRae, appears therein under the head of “Erysipelas of the Leg”)—since our connection with the Hospital, the Register has never been behind.” * * * *

“And we can positively affirm that the Register was duly written up at the period of the investigation into McRae’s charge, when Dr. Bowerbank inspected it. Had he not permitted the perceptions of his imagination to obscure the accuracy of his visual examination, he would have perceived that the “Robert Thomson McRae,” aged ten years, who was discharged from the hospital on the 24th April, nearly two weeks before the institution of this investigation, and who had been admitted for “Erysipelas of the Leg.”

I repeat, that at the time I stated it, it was a fact, that the books were not written up—this if requisite can be proved on oath—it must be obvious, however, that this did not prevent their being written up at the time I inspected the Register.

I was really surprised to find the Medical Officers stating "that since their connection with the hospital, the Register had never been behind," when I had heard it from the Inspector and Director, that great complaints had been made by the Medical Officers especially by Dr. Fiddes against Dr. Stern, for omitting the performance of this portion of his duty, as Senior Resident Medical Officer.

Reference to the Register itself, will confirm what I say—and on reference to the summary of diseases treated during the year 1862-63, in the Public Hospital, it will be found that 101 patients have no description in the Register, as regards their diseases, &c.

True it is, that this occurred before McRae's enquiry—but while Dr. Dunn and yourself were the Ordinary Medical Officers of the Hospital.

I would here, too, ask yourself and Dr. Dunn, if when Dr. Stern met with his accident the Register was duly written up?

As to my mistaking Robert Thompson McRae, for Allan McRae, this blunder occurred in consequence of my running my eye down the list of surnames in the register, and there happening to be two McRae's in at the same time, I mistook the one for the other—this is a trivial mistake, and one that was acknowledged and explained by me the moment it was pointed out to me at a meeting of the Board.

If, I repeat, on the face of these bold denials of my statements, his Excellency the Governor thought proper to withdraw any censure he had passed on the medical officer whose duty it was to keep up the Register, it certainly was no fault of mine. I was never consulted, most assuredly I knew nothing of such censure having been passed on other officers, and I knew nothing of its withdrawal, with the exception of that on one officer, Dr. Stern, as set forth in the minutes.

I did my duty fearlessly and conscientiously, and without consulting any one, or caring for the opinions of any one.

As regards "the Governor altering his mind and withdrawing certain censures he had passed upon certain *officers* of the hospital, much was said on this subject, by certain members of a Committee of the House of Assembly, before whom it will be found the letter from Dr. Dunn and yourself was produced. Some of these honorable gentlemen declared, they had heard of such letters; but not one would allow, he had seen them except that to Dr. Stern, or would direct the Chairman, (myself), to summon any one to produce them. Under these circumstances I went as Chairman of the Committee, to his Excellency the Governor, and stated to him what was alleged by certain members; he directed his Secretary to place in my hands any letters which had emanated from the office on such subject.—There were *none*, and *had been none*, with the exception of that to Dr. Stern.

Surely, if such documents do exist you should have placed them on record, seeing that they are no where recorded.

You next mention the Committee of the House of Assembly, which I have above alluded to. This Committee was moved for by myself, to consider the present condition of the Public Hospital. I acted as Chairman of it. On that occasion, you gave evidence, and

on two occasions while in the Committee Room of the House of Assembly, you had the impertinence and indelicacy to interfere with witnesses while giving evidence on oath, such evidence being contrary to your wishes, and to your evidence. After the Committee had sat for some time and taken a great mass of valuable evidence in a most irregular way, I moved for an ad-interim report and the publication of evidence taken for the use of members. I was informed that a *sine qua non* of this being agreed to, was my sanctioning a letter from you and Dr. Dunn to the Inspector and Director of the Public Hospital, being placed on the evidence; I asked what this letter was, and was informed that it was the letter of Dr. Dunn and yourself forwarded through Mr. Trench to the Governor. The same is printed in the Appendix No. 6, and is one abusive of myself.

I immediately acquiesced, although I considered the movement or dodge, disgraceful and irregular. Your obsequious self was forthwith introduced, presented the letter, and while I read it, disappeared.

I annex an extract from my evidence, given before that Committee, with reference to this transaction, as Appendix No. 7.

I may add, the whole examination is published in the Votes of the House of Assembly for 1863-64.

Your remark, as to the Governor desiring Mr. Trench the Inspector and Director to withhold this letter from the Committee of the House, and to forward only the extracts as sent down by him to the Board of Visitors, does in my opinion, prove the consistency of his Excellency. I have no hesitation in stating that when I read this letter for the first time, I thought Dr. Dunn and yourself had been guilty of a most cowardly act in not requesting the Inspector to furnish the Board of Visitors with a copy of it, or even to have shown it to myself as Chairman of the Board, and the person attacked in it. The medical officers of the Hospital were present during the whole enquiry into McCrae's case, and heard the entire evidence, statements, and reports. Yet, after the whole affair was over, and the inquiry closed, they sent in to the Governor through the Inspector a letter, replete with abuse of one member of the Board, (myself), and which letter I should never have seen but for the appointment of the Committee of the House of Assembly. I repeat, that when the medical officers found their letter to the Governor, sent down to the Board of Visitors in the shape of mere fragments with all its wickedness and devilry extracted, if they had had a particle of principle or honorable spirit about them, they would have resisted, and if requisite, have resigned their appointments.—But no, we found nothing of the kind, and I repeat, the sneaking manner in which the letter was sent to the Governor, says little for the honour and candour of those concerned in it.

Your inferences and remarks as to Governor Eyre "having abandoned his independence and relinquished his judgment in Hospital matters to Dr. Bowerbank," are of course *your* opinions—the creatures of your own imagination, and are too contemptible to require comment, coming as they do from you, a crossed and disappointed man, giving way to anger and personal abuse, to cover his hasty and weak acts.

As to my entries in the Visitors' book with reference to the Annual Reports of the Medical officers, for the year 1862-3, which you are pleased to term "a criticism replete with insinuations and arithmetical blunders," I will only observe that I do not boast of, or pride myself on my knowledge of numbers, but I have good reason to be pleased with the result of what you call my "arithmetical blunders," seeing that they gave rise the next year to a great saving in the Institution. Thus in consequence of the changes they produced in the dietary of the patients, 275 more patients were treated during the year 1863-64, and the total expenditure was £712. 0. 0. below that of the previous year, the greater portion of such saving having been effected on articles of food. I also felt it to be my duty to point out that it was not fair to compare the Kingston Hospital, with those of London, as was being done, the Kingston Hospital being at that time, as much a poor house or refuge for the destitute and incurable, as a Hospital for the reception of the sick; and I also felt it to be my duty to point out that the lessened mortality depended upon the diminished number of inmates, and the option given to the Medical officers to accept or reject candidates for admission.

As to your charge against me for casting "censure upon the Hospital Report for 1863-64, *merely* because the Medical officers had expressed their opinion on the salubrity of the Hospital site, was an act of official arrogance and presumption beyond the limits of professional endurance:" on this point you will find my answer in my letter to the editor of "the Medical Times and Gazette." I can quite understand your feelings on this point. I can readily imagine that any medical man who had given such contradictory see-saw opinions, out of office, and in office, could not view their exposure with *endurance* and equanimity. I observe in your reply to this letter, published in "the Colonial Standard," you take no notice of this bitter dose. "So far from the Governor checking or putting a stop to these improper proceedings he seems rather to have given encouragement to them." Well, the Government might approve of these proceedings and encourage them too, seeing that they tended to material reforms, and lessened the expenditure of the Institution. For your information, I may state that when in consequence of the appointment of Dr. Anderson to the office of ordinary medical officer, I felt it to be my duty in accordance with the provisions of the Acts, to abstain from further attendance at the meeting of the Board of Visitors, and on retiring, I received from the Governor in Executive Committee, a letter thanking me for my services as a visitor.

You next observe, "to cap the climax of the whole he (the Governor) finally entrusted the Board of Visitors, consisting virtually of Dr. Bowerbank and his two kinsmen, with full power to adjudicate upon the retirement or re-appointment of the several members of the medical staff." Here is again an attempt to mislead the public—how could the Governor alter the law, or how could he be blamed if the members of the Board would not attend?

Myself and my two *kinsmen*, Dr. Campbell and the Rector of Kingston, I trust will never be found wanting in the performance of our duties, and are quite regardless of the insinuations of any man,

or set of men opposed to all that is good and virtuous in a community—regardless of all that is religious, moral and truthful.

I may observe here, that it was my "kinsman," the Rector of Kingston, who drew up the report, to which I dissented. On that occasion, did you think it necessary to make use of any insinuations? No, Sir—this rule for the periodical retirement of the Ordinary Medical Officers was disagreeable to you.

Your remarks certainly, do not flatter the other members of the Board of Visitors, who by your account must be mere nonentities—mere stocks—I am glad at any rate, you do not include me among this portion.

You state, "the Governor so played into Dr. Bowerbank's hands as to enable him to obtain the object which he so long desired—that of getting the hospital entirely under his own control." Now this is a gratuitous assertion on your part—as false as it is insolent.

You next tell the public, "I being fully cognizant of all the movements in the game."

Really this is amusing—another insinuation—"not strictly in accordance with truth."

Next comes the truest sentence in your communication, "and perceiving that my means of self-defence would be materially diminished by Dr. Dunn's retirement, I had no alternative but to resign my office."

In consequence of the periodical retirement of the Ordinary Medical Officers being carried out by the Governor, in accordance with the Law—but against your wishes and opposition, you got annoyed, and resigned in a huff—like a big sulky schoolboy—regardless of the interests of the Institution, or the welfare of the patients.

On the 29th December, 1864—you tendered your resignation. Dr. Dunn had then received notice to retire. On the 19th December, Dr. Dunn and yourself had answered the communication of the Inspector and Director, respecting the wasteful diet allowed to a class of patients in the Hospital—this was doubtless in your opinion, great presumption in that officer—but a duty he should long before have performed—It was annoying to you.

On the 5th January, 1865, in a note in reply to one from the Governor in Executive Committee, you give your reasons for resigning your appointment, and you there lay the blame of your doing so, on me.

You state, "unfortunately the system of Hospital management under the present Board of Visitors is such, that no Medical man having regard for his professional character can possibly serve as one of the responsible Medical Officers of the Institution." From your own statements, matters were wrong long before; "conspiracies to crush" members of the medical staff existed among the members of the Board in May 1863. Your annual report for 1862-63, had been unfairly criticised by the Chairman of the Board, and that for 1863-64 had been commented upon, in a manner which surpassed "all professional endurance." Why after all this, did you continue in office? Where, all this time, was your excessive regard for "professional character?" Of course if the Responsi-

ble Medical Officers of any institution, presume to draw up annual reports which are not strictly *true*, but are calculated to mislead and these circumstances are pointed out by the visitors, the professional character of such officers is likely to suffer, and may well cause them anxiety.

You next write, "in a most unjustifiable manner, Dr. Bowerbank has succeeded in driving away from the Board of Visitors nearly all the gentlemen who have been appointed to constitute it."

Here, Sir, is another of your unfounded statements "not strictly in accordance with truth," intended to mislead the public. Why do you not name the gentlemen of the Board I drove away? I have spoken to the majority of them, and I tell you, that in making this statement, you are guilty of another wicked misstatement.—There have been, I allow, great changes in the Board of Visitors since its first constitution; but let me ask you, how many of them resigned, not on account of any act of mine, but because they could not find time to attend; how many have never once attended? Surely these were not driven away by me. How many resigned when they found they could not act as visitors, and be at the same time contractors for supplies to the institution? How many left the island? how many died? How do you account for the fact, that since I retired from the Board, though several times summoned to meet, they have never succeeded in forming a quorum? And now, Sir, I have no hesitation in telling you, that I believe that one member *was* driven away from the Board, and that, in consequence not of my conduct, but of yours at the McCrea enquiry.

Here again, you assuredly pay the gentlemen you allude to, no compliment. You surely charge them with physical and moral cowardice, with faithlessness to their trust. No wonder, you think that medical men should not be on the Board of Visitors; when reports are to be got up for effect—the supervision of such members must be unpleasant. I do not think you can name the board of managers of any hospital in Great Britain or the West Indies, which does not include medical men.

I am happy to be able to inform you, that the Board of Visitors of the Lunatic Asylum, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, has worked well, and on no single occasion, has there been any dissension among them, although several, are also members of the Hospital Board, and I am glad to say that the best feelings exist between the members of the Board and the medical officer, and the reports are freely scrutinised and criticised, and are always strictly true.

Your proposal to the Government to constitute you the sole guardian of the hospital in spite of law, rules, &c., is to say the least of it, amusing, and shows the vanity which lurks about you. No, Sir, I feel confident that the Governor and his government after considering your conduct in the Jobern matter, and after reading your evidence before the Committee of the House of Assembly, aye and after perusing the remarks in the Visitors' book, as to diet, &c. would never entrust the institution to your sole charge.

On the 20th January 1865, you ceased your attendance at the Public Hospital.

You state "I am glad to say I have received the support of the members of my profession as to the the line of conduct I have pursued." Here again is a "*suppressio veri*," another attempt to mislead. To be truthful, you should have added the word "some,"—for most assuredly some in Kingston, and far more of the profession in the island, do not approve of your conduct; they do not think you have upheld the dignity and moral bearing of our common profession; but many think that "*Te duce*" your party, have dragged the dignity of the profession through the dirt. You have sullied its fair name, and caused the right thinking public, to look upon its members with contempt.

You have, I am willing to allow, some medical men apparently willing to do your bidding, whatever this may be.

You observe "I had nothing to gain personally by throwing up a salaried appointment and coming to a rupture with the Governor and Dr. Bowerbank; I would rather have avoided these, but it is evident that I could not have done so without a sacrifice of principle; and my duty to the profession made it imperative on me to act as I have done."

I have already stated that you had spoken of "throwing up this "salaried appointment, as taking up too much of your time." I do not believe the miserable salary was an inducement to you to hold it; but forsooth, after holding it so long under the grievous misconduct of the Chairman to you, I repeat, it would have been well, to have left out all about "principle," and "duty to the profession."

Your next statement is contradictory, as usual. "I have willingly and voluntarily retired from the hospital." Is this in accordance with your previous statement, "I had no alternative but to resign my office?"

You then go on, "and given place to Dr. Bowerbank who has thereby secured the long coveted object of his wishes." Here, Sir, is another attempt to mislead. You would have people I suppose to believe, that you thought or knew that if you resigned I would accept the office. As to that appointment being "the coveted object of my wishes," here again, is a gratuitous assertion and a falsehood.

On your resigning your office, the Governor offered to re-appoint Dr. Dunn, this he declined. Under these circumstances, I was applied to, and very much against my own wishes, and inclination, and interests, I consented to act temporarily. At the time I accepted it, my health had been very indifferent, as you yourself well know, for months' past; and I had been urged to leave the island for a few months' which I fully made up my mind to do. Expecting my partner Dr. Campbell to return from Europe in October, I determined "to leave as soon as possible after his return;" I therefore in July last apprised the Governor in Executive Committee of my intention to retire at the end of the financial year, which terminates on the 30th September.

I can assure you, my appointment to the hospital although a salaried one, has been no object to me; on the contrary it has been a severe drag and hindrance to me; but while there, I have striven

to do my duty fearlessly and honestly, in spite of all the obloquy, and abuse heaped upon me, and the opposition and insult offered me by yourself and your clique.

I trust, when the annual report is published, it will be found that the interests of the institution or its inmates have not suffered, and that its management and sanitary status have improved. I have little fear that your prophecy and fervent wishes will be verified or fulfilled, "that Governor Eyre and Dr. Bowerbank will be impaled on the horns of a dilemma." As to your personal abuse of myself, coming from you, I heed it not. I verily believe that Governor Eyre, like myself, is actuated by a determination to do his duty, in our respective stations, quite unmoved by the cries and complaints of the factious, the dissatisfied, and the unprincipled.

To your question, "but what next?" I will only observe, beware, lest the conduct you are now pursuing, places you without the pale of society.

I have now, Sir, very hurriedly and imperfectly, and I suppose you will add "in my usual desultory style," "put my finger" upon a great many sentences in your letters of the 23rd and 25th January, "which are not strictly in accordance with truth," in fact, I fear there is hardly a single sentence, which is honestly and truthfully conceived.

Let us now pass on and consider briefly the correspondence in "the Medical Times and Gazette," as also in your reply to the Editor of the "Colonial Standard" of the date of August 23rd.

The origin of this correspondence was the holding of an inquest on the body of one Richard Bailey, a patient in the Public Hospital, who having had a catheter broken in his bladder, refused for several days to have it removed; at length he consented, and in the absence of urethral forceps, the broken portion of catheter was removed by an incision behind the scrotum, the patient a very old man with chronic disease of the kidneys, died a few days after.

Contrary to all propriety and decency, (yourself and Dr. Dunn) who had shortly before retired from the hospital, promoted an enquiry, and instigated the Coroner, Dr. Altman, to hold an inquest, which he did.

True it is, that Dr. Anderson and myself in consequence of a most singular message which had been sent down from the House of Assembly relative to this case, as also from assertions in the Newspapers, that we had ill-treated the case, did call upon the Inspector to inform the Coroner of his (Bailey's) death, supposing that this officer would as usual, in all such cases have instituted a preliminary enquiry—this he did not do—but at once made up his mind to hold an inquest, and summoned every Medical man in Kingston, with the exception of Dr. Allen, without having said one single word to Dr. Anderson or myself on the subject.

When I took charge, as one of the Ordinary Medical Officers of the Public Hospital on the 21st January—there was a patient in the Surgical wards under peculiar circumstances, who it was thought was likely to die. I told the Inspector that if he died, I should call upon him to acquaint the Coroner with the facts.

of his case, and I expressed my determination that in every case in which there was any circumstance attending the death of a patient, the least peculiar, or out of the way, I would call upon him to acquaint the Coroner. This I did, well knowing the hornets' nest I was entering, and what I should have to encounter. I certainly did not anticipate, that in such cases, the Coroner would at once, without any enquiry into the case—hold an inquest—and summon all the Medical men of the city to give their opinions as to the treatment pursued.

Coroner Altman, now acts very differently from what he did, when Dr. Scott was the Medical Officer of the Hospital. Now, he seems anxious to hold inquests—then he was backward in doing so; in fact he would not hold them—he then declared them to be unnecessary, and in every case he instituted a preliminary investigation.

The whole proceedings of this inquest were disgraceful and irregular on the part of the Coroner himself, the jury, and the medical witnesses; and after sitting many days, the following absurd and senseless verdict was returned.

“The Jurors find that Richard Bailey died at the Public Hospital on the 11th day of February 1865; that he laboured under chronic disease, and that his death was hastened by improper surgical treatment in that institution.”

As might be expected, such an ignorant verdict was taken no notice of by the law officers of the Crown, and there it stands a memorial of the malevolence, ill will, and ignorance of the promoters, the Coroner, the Jurors, and the medical witnesses, who conceived, gestated, and gave it birth.

At the same time, with the assistance of your clique, you did all you could to traduce the private and professional character of Dr. Anderson and myself, by scribbling false statements both at home and in some of the Newspapers of this island.

I may add here, that disgusted at the unprofessional, ungentlemanly, and wicked conduct of the Medical witnesses, I left the inquest at an early period with Dr. Anderson, and therefore our Medical opponents had it all their own way. Neither Dr. Anderson nor myself, or any one for us, sent home a single notice or Newspaper bearing on the subject, being content to wait till all was over.

The “Medical Times and Gazette” for the 25th March, 1865, contained an article on the subject, headed “Colonial Medical Ethics.” In the number for May 27th, is a letter from yourself—and in the number for 29th July, are two letters, the one from Dr. Anderson, relative to the treatment and death of Richard Bailey, and the other from myself in reply to your communication of the date of the 24th April, and published in the number of 27th May, together with your reply to my letter above referred to of the date 23rd August, and published in the “Colonial Standard” of the 24th August. I have not considered it necessary to insert here Dr. Anderson's letter, as not bearing on the subject at issue. These communications require I think, but little comment from me—they speak for themselves, and the remarks of the Editor of the “Medical Times and Gazette” are short but trite.

I will now, Sir, proceed to deal with your conduct, subsequent to the appearance of my letter in the "Medical Times and Gazette," and would notice first, the decisive and sudden death-blow which the Editor of that distinguished journal inflicted upon your "Bailey's Inquest triumph," so soon as the real facts of the case had been brought to his knowledge. In his remarks appended to Dr. Anderson's letter, we find the following:—

"Dr. Anderson's account of the Surgical treatment adopted in Bailey's case, places it in a new light. If it is true, as he asserts, that the patient obstinately refused to allow any Surgical interference, and that no urethral forceps was believed by him to exist in the island, we think Dr. Anderson entirely exonerated."—ED. M. T.

As regards the support you stated you obtained from the "Lancet," and of which you were very proud, this has now failed you.—The "Lancet" of the 19th August which arrived by the packet on the 20th September evidently withdraws its support from you as to the Bailey case—it evidently leaves the reader to infer that the Editor had been misled by hasty, partial, and incorrect statements, and that the full and calm explanation of Dr. Anderson, since received, has induced him to alter his opinions. Never was there a truer exemplification of that line of Tacitus.

"Veritas visu et mora, falsa festinatione et incertis valescunt,"

"Truth is confirmed by inspection and delay; falsehood avails itself of haste and uncertainty."

I will quote from the "Lancet":—

"Further communications from Jamaica have been received, which certainly tend to place the affair of the inquest on Richard Bailey, in a somewhat different light from that in which we previously regarded it.

Dr. Anderson, for whose abilities as a promising surgeon—one of the few successful English performers of the *cæsarean* section—we have a high respect, may rest assured that no sort of animosity to himself entered our minds; and it is to be regretted that what appeared to be the strong points of his case, were not more briefly stated in the letter which he originally addressed to the "Lancet," in which case they would have excited more attention on our part. The fact that urethral forceps were not attainable by Dr. Anderson, is important; but what is even more important is, the new light thrown on the retirement of the former medical officers of the hospital, which would seem to have been necessitated by the termination of the period during which they could legally hold office. It seems almost impossible, amid the hubbub of discordant statements which distract the press and the profession of Jamaica, to ascertain exactly where right and justice lay in some of the recent changes at the Kingston Hospital. We would earnestly repeat the expression of our hope, that the disputes which agitate the profession in Jamaica may cease, and that in a new organization of the hospital management, the constitution of the governing body, may be made a *bona fide* affair, a Committee of thoroughly educated and intelligent laymen (with a proper mixture of the medical element,) being set over the affairs of the establishment, as would be the case in Eng-

land, and free from all arbitrary interference by Government authority."

As one of the Medical Officers who saw, and attended Richard Bailey, I have not the slightest hesitation in now repeating, what I have over and over again stated, that in spite of all the talk and expressed opinions of the Medical witnesses at the inquest, under similar circumstances, I would do precisely the same again.

In your letter to the "Medical Times," you observe "with regard to the conduct of myself, and the other practitioners in the city, who gave evidence at the inquest on Richard Bailey, I have only to observe that neither I, nor any of them, are blameable for the unfortunate result of that enquiry—The Inquest was demanded by the Inspector of the Hospital, and I with all the members of the profession in the city, was summoned by the Coroner to give evidence thereat. The testimony which was there adduced was no doubt damaging to Drs. Bowerbank and Anderson, the principal medical officers, but it was impossible for any medical witness who had due regard to his own professional reputation, and the sanctity of his oath, to help them out of their difficulty."

Very pretty all this—considering you were the chief promoter of the whole affair. You and others, of your medical clique, harmoniously forced on the poor weak Coroner to hold this Inquest. You led on and cajoled an incompetent and prejudiced jury, to their verdict. "The sanctity of your oath"—forsooth—where is its sanctity by your own showing—when towards the close of your letter you wrote "These gentlemen (eight medical witnesses and twelve jurors) after a patient enquiry of seven days' duration unanimously returned a verdict to the effect that Richard Bailey died from improper surgical treatment. Such a verdict is no doubt a painful one to those more immediately affected by it, but it was impossible that the jurors could arrive at any other decision—*Nor will, Dr. Bowerbank himself, be much surprised at it, if he reflects that for the last five or six years, he has openly and avowedly ignored the professional qualifications of every medical man who has been connected with the Hospital during the last twenty years.*"

Here Sir, you have committed a sad blunder—you have let the cat out of the bag—So much for the regard entertained by you and your clique "for the sanctity of an oath." After this, to talk of this Inquest having been held, for the purpose of ascertaining the cause of Bailey's death, is a farce, a mockery. You and your clique after this, may cease your asseverations of innocency, of not having been concerned in the enquiry, except as skilled witnesses summoned to give evidence. You yourself have here distinctly confessed your conspiracy with your medical supporters, and your complicity with your obsequious jurors, to do what? to enquire into the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as concerned Bailey's treatment and death?

No, Sir, but to pay off Dr. Bowerbank by calling in question his professional qualifications, "for having openly and avowedly ignored the professional qualifications of every medical man, who has been connected with the hospital during the last five (not twenty) years."

And who, Sir, let me ask you were these medical witnesses? — They were six in number (not eight) as follows: —

Alexander Fiddes, F.R.C.S., Edin.
James Scott, M.R.C.S., Lond.
Andrew Dunn, M.D, L.R.C.S., Edin.
Charles Lake, L.R.C.S., Edin.
Edward Robinson. M.R.C.S., Lond.
Moritz Stern, M.R.C.S., Engl.

You have each and all of you, Sir, been connected with the Public Hospital and Lunatic Asylum, and each and all of you, have ceased your connection with these Institutions directly or indirectly in consequence of legal enactments founded on my proposed Reforms.

“Hinc illæ lacrymæ.”

After your explanation, of how or why, this verdict was arrived at, I am not “much surprised” at it, nor will the community here be surprised, nor the Editors of the “Lancet” and “Medical Gazette.” However, on “reflection,” all must be shocked and disgusted at members of the medical profession, banding together to wreak their vengeance on an individual for the acts of the Legislature, and this too, under cover and in direct violation of a solemn oath taken to enquire into the treatment and death of a patient in the hospital, of itself a most unheard of procedure. As for you and your clique “helping me out of my difficulties,” I beg you will all wait till you are asked to do so. I am not so innocent a little lamb, as to apply to ravening wolves, for aid.

I am truly glad to find, that you allow by words at any rate, “the existence of the operations of retributive justice in the moral government of our planet.” Would that you would do so, also by your acts as a professional man and a citizen.

I think, Sir, after the above instance of your value of an oath, of your regard for its sanctity. I may pay little heed to your charges against me of want of veracity. No, Sir, I flatter myself that I am too open and unreserved, too plain spoken and fearless of speech to be as you state a “facilis princeps” in falsifying. Here from my experience of you, I yield you the palm, and shall be quite content that the public should judge us by our actions and not by our words.

You have in your communication to the “Colonial Standard,” of the date of 23rd August, asserted with unblushing effrontery, and with a boldness increasing in proportion to my continued forbearance in taking no notice of your assertions, that the statements of my letter to the “Medical Times and Gazette” are untrue, and you deny the words and conduct which I therein imputed to you. I regret deeply to be again compelled to stigmatize this denial of yours, with your own favorite and opprobrious epithet, but I must take leave to shift the “lie” to its proper place, and I again declare and repeat, that every word of my letter to the “Medical Times,” is strictly true. This happily is a fact which does not depend on the unsupported testimony of my own assertion. The terms in which you spoke to myself of your young professional friend, were added to, repeated, and re-

iterated in the hearing of various witnesses of unimpeachable veracity—of those one has been removed by death ; I allude to Dr. Dignum—among the others, I will mention the names of Drs. Jobern, Belisario, Charles Campbell, Izett W. Anderson, and the late Inspector and Director, Mr. Trench, besides these, others have heard it indirectly ; and in addition, there are some respectable gentlemen in Kingston, with whose names I have reason to know you are already acquainted, and have been so for some time, who have declared my statements to be correct, and who I feel assured will speak the truth when called on to do so ; and, Sir, there are others, who if summoned and sworn, must state what they know.

Truly, Sir, your conduct is strange to say the least of it—you have known of one gentleman having asserted that my statements were true, for at least one month. What have you done ? Is it a fact, that you did after three weeks silence, write to him to request him to give up his authority for his statement ? Is it a fact, that you declared, that on hearing the name of his informant you would meet him face to face “ and give him the lie ? ” Is it a fact, that you got his name, and that you have taken no notice ? Surely, you would not be guilty of “ braggadocia ”—or worse still Sir, is it a fact that in spite of what you said you would do, you are now carrying on a most pacific correspondence with that gentleman—in hopes of “ being yourself let down softly ? ” Are you trying instead of “ giving the lie ” to compromise the matter—if so, the public whose approbation you hope to have, will not be satisfied. You must clear up this matter. The truth, the whole truth—and nothing but the truth.

The truth is great, and will prevail in spite of all your efforts to hide it.

Now, Sir, I am at a loss to know whether you ought to be most ashamed at your meanness and hypocrisy in running down the character of a young gentleman whom you had made use of, and whom you professed to patronize and befriend ; or, your audacity in now attempting to deny words which have been spoken by you so often, and in the presence of so many witnesses.

The circumstance of your present, of the amputating case of instruments, to which you have appealed in support of your animus and veracity, unfortunately cannot help you. I have recently seen the value which you place upon the worth of your own testimonials, in the case of the one which you gave to Dr. Anderson, when he was about to leave this island to accept the office of House Surgeon in the Demerara Hospital.

I repeat, I did feel disgusted at the Mc Crea enquiry, to hear the Medical officers, Dr. Dunn and yourself—lauding up the senior resident Medical officer for his zeal and assiduity, after what I knew you had said, and when as the minutes of the Board of Visitors state on the 28th May, at the Meeting of the board, the “honble. George Solomon requested information from Dr. Fiddes, as to whether some time ago, he did not present Dr. Stern with a Testimonial as a token of the appreciation of the assiduity and efficiency exhibited in this Institution by that gentleman. To which Dr Fiddes replied in the affirmative, but that it was a *private testimonial* though for meritorious and good conduct in the discharge of his official duties



I listened most attentively to your answer, and sitting at the opposite end of the table to you, I was struck with your hesitating and confused manner, and the cautious way in which you stated it to be a "*private testimonial*" for you must have remembered that on speaking to you about Dr. Jobern being attached to the Hospital, I alluded to this testimonial which I had seen, and that on that occasion I had from your own mouth, the true history of the said testimonial, namely, that you had presented it under the following circumstances; that as it was impossible for you though holding the office of House Surgeon of the Hospital to reside there, Governor Darling had sanctioned your employing and paying an assistant to act as your deputy, independent of the Resident assistant house Surgeon—that in accordance with this arrangement you had tried to obtain the services of such a person, but had experienced difficulty and delay in doing so—that in the meantime these duties were performed by the senior resident assistant house Surgeon of the Hospital, to whom therefore you were indebted,—and that under these circumstances you had presented him with the case of instruments. In fact it was not in any sense intended to be a testimonial of Hospital efficiency, but simply a cheap and unnecessary acknowledgement of *private* services rendered to you.

Let me repeat, your testimonial to Dr. Anderson still exists, and after your recent heartless, cruel, and unprofessional conduct to him, it stands a monument of your insincerity, and of the principles on which you give testimonials of a man's character and ability. Your consistency in regard to these testimonials is about equalled by your opinions as to the salubrity of the site of the Public Hospital, which I have treated of fully in my letter to the "*Medical Times*."

I will here quote your opinion of Dr. Anderson as given in your testimonial.

" KINGSTON, JAMAICA, 6th August, 1860.

" An acquaintance with Dr. Izett Anderson of six years' duration, enables me to offer my testimony to his fitness to undertake the duties of his profession—During his preliminary studies at the Kingston Hospital, I had many opportunities of noticing his zeal and industry, and afterwards, in the year 1857 when I had occasion to be in Edinburgh for some months, I was further enabled to observe his success as a student of that university, where he was recognized by all who knew him, as a most painstaking and exemplary cultivator of his profession. Since his return to this country within the last few months, I have seen with great satisfaction that he has made good use of his time, and that he has acquired an excellent knowledge of his profession; his uniform propriety and integrity of conduct are also most commendable, and I can have no hesitation in stating that he is in every way likely to prove an *ornament to his calling*. I sincerely wish him the success of which he is so deserving, and I can with the greatest confidence, recommend him as one in every way deserving of confidence and encouragement.

" (SIGNED) ALEX. FIDDES,

" Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh."

Such Sir, was your testimonial to this young man—whom I have known I may say from his birth. I too, had occasion to visit Edinburgh during his studentship, and can verify all you say, besides which Dr. Anderson had formed an intimate acquaintance with my nephew Dr. Dignum, who you know came out to join my firm, but after a few months succumbed to disease—Over and over again he told me of Dr. Anderson's good qualities and professional abilities; and when my partner Dr. Campbell was about to leave the Island on a temporary trip, I proposed to him that we should send to Demerara and ask Dr. Anderson to join us. He did so, and I can assure you that my good opinion of Dr. Anderson has gained ground every day. Your opinion of him as expressed in your testimonial is correct, *is true*, and a further and closer acquaintance with him has endeared him to me as a brother—but Sir, since he came here he has crossed your path in Hospital matters as my partner, and you now try to prove him ignorant of the elements of his profession—you do this at your own expense, your abuse now raises his character precisely in the same ratio that it sinks your own.

I think I have now sufficiently answered your several communications, and I think "I have put my finger on sentences" enough, "not strictly in accordance with truth," to satisfy even you, that your statements founded even on documentary evidence are hastily and recklessly made.

I repeat, I will not condescend to answer your insinuations and personal abuse of myself—I have done my duty as a Visitor of the Hospital, conscientiously and without fear or affection for anybody; and in now breaking the silence which I have hitherto maintained. I am fully aware of the disadvantages to which I am exposing myself by engaging in controversy with an adversary who is so utterly regardless of the sacred obligations of truth and candour, and who has recently shewn himself in his conduct to myself and others, altogether indifferent to the courtesies and proprieties always observed by gentlemen and the members of a learned profession.

As a Christian, a physician, and a magistrate, it would be impossible for me to imitate, or even to reply to much of the language in which you have not scrupled to indulge. If I were to consult the advice and wishes of many valued friends, both here and in Europe, I should treat your abusive and slanderous attacks with the silent contempt which they deserve. But as you have appealed to some facts and written documents, I have met you on this ground and you now have my reply.

Thus far, Sir, one would have thought you would have been satisfied to have carried your malevolent and revengeful feelings against Dr. Anderson and myself; but no; You have declared that "you will do all you can to injure me," or as you have elegantly termed it, "to put me on my back," and your rabidity towards Dr. Anderson, is evident from your ungentlemanly and intemperate writings in the newspapers.

It was not my intention here to have entered into Bell's case. Unjustly and unfairly treated as Dr. Anderson and myself were at the inquest, held upon it, we called upon the Government to afford us an opportunity of putting in our statements or giving our evi-

dence as to Bell's treatment and death. Difficulties however of a technical kind have arisen, and it is now discovered that no such enquiry can be satisfactorily instituted. Under these circumstances, we have resolved to make public our evidence, which the Coroner at your instigation refused to receive, and I am happy to inform you that this was published in time to go home by the Packet of the 25th instant. By order of his Excellency the Governor the honorable A. G. Fyfe and Mr. H. J. Bicknell, have for some days past been engaged in receiving from any person who could give it, personal evidence as to the treatment and cause of death of David Bell; this evidence is confined to mere facts and has not been taken on oath, and I find it is now being published in the newspapers. This enquiry is now concluded, and the result made known to the government; and I may observe that none of the opposing medical witnesses have made their appearance, nor has Dr. Field, who is now no longer connected with the institution, he having some time back tendered his resignation. I will, however, here make a few remarks on the case, as if Bailey's case was disgraceful to the parties concerned in it, Bell's is far more so. If your conduct is now being condemned in England on Bailey's case, it will be most severely censured in Bell's.

The facts are these, David Bell a very old, infirm, half-starved African, was admitted into the Public Hospital on the 6th July last, suffering from what was supposed at the time to be "diffused, popliteal aneurism," the man's history was very vague, and the tumour being of a very large size, 20 inches round the knee and there being no pulsation or bruit, the diagnosis was very difficult and obscure; a difference of opinion existed among the medical gentlemen who saw it. The man's health by dint of rest, sleep at night, and good feeding, improved, it was therefore agreed by the Responsible Medical officers, that so long as there was no urgency, and while a difference of opinion as to its nature existed, operative interference should be delayed. As the man's health improved, (it was discovered that he was suffering from disease of the heart,) the tumour of the leg increased and unmistakable symptoms of active interstitial absorption displayed themselves, threatening hæmorrhage. Under these circumstances, after weighing well the symptoms of the case; it was agreed to interfere. It was explained to the patient that until he was under the influence of chloroform (which he insisted on taking,) it was impossible to state exactly what the nature of the operation to be performed, would be, but that most likely his leg would have to be amputated above the knee, he consented.

Previous to the operation on the 22nd July, directions had been given to have ready at hand the amputating instruments, as also a grooved needle and an aneurismal needle. The patient was then placed under chloroform and the tourniquet screwed up, when Dr. Anderson twice introduced the exploring needle. As we knew a difference of opinion existed on the part of two gentlemen present, as to the nature of the disease, we had agreed to do this. This examination satisfied us of the nature of the disease and of the necessity for amputation; but to remove all possible doubt a puncture was made with a scalpel, the finger introduced, and forthwith the limb was taken off at the lower third of the thigh, there was little hæmorrhage, but towards

the close of the operation extreme collapse came on. After an anxious period, the patient rallied; and progressed favorably for two days; on the third day he began to sink and died on the fourth day from sheer exhaustion—the limb after being removed, was examined, and every one present allowed it was a case of Diffused Popliteal Aneurism—The body also after death was examined, and exhibited marks of serious disease of the heart and dilatation of the Aorta.

Some days after the man had been buried, the Coroner addressed the Inspector and Director, requesting to know through the Medical Officers, the treatment Bell had received and the cause of his death—this was forthwith furnished, and a request made that the Coroner if he wished further information would communicate direct with the Medical Officers, according to his usual custom in such cases. In reply a letter was received stating that the explanation as to the treatment and death was not full enough, and therefore unsatisfactory. The Coroner was then invited to state the points on which he wished further information—and it was suggested to him to meet the Medical Officers at the Public Hospital—the object being to afford him the easiest means of obtaining the best and most authentic information from the Books and Officers of the Institution. Dr. Altman (the Coroner) who was well known to be acting under your advice and instigation, and to have no will or mind of his own in the matter rejected our proposal as dictatorial, and announced his intention of holding an Inquest. This he did after great difficulty, for many of the more respectable and intelligent portion of the community would not pay any attention to his summons, they would not come, and the poor, weak man, did not dare to exercise his power to compel them, and after great irregularities practised in forming a Jury, the majority of an inferior class of men selected and warned by himself personally, the Enquiry was commenced, a post-mortem examination of the body after having been buried 14 days was ordered to be performed, and also of the amputated leg after it had been buried 18 days. The very same medical men as were summoned in Bailey's case were again called in—and I hesitate not to say, that a more disreputable and disgraceful affair was never transacted.

The whole enquiry lasting for days, was an exhibition of the foulest and worst passions which prevade the human breast. Dr. Anderson and myself against whom the whole was aimed (for to say that the enquiry was to ascertain the cause of Bell's death is a farce—the Coroner knew that—the object was to put the ordinary medical officers of the Hospital on their trial—to do as had been done in Bailey's case—get their evidence and then set upon them a pack of hungry disappointed medical men to pick it to pieces and by fair or foul means to trump up a charge against them, and by misleading an ignorant jury to prove it)—did not again choose to submit ourselves to such an illegal and disgraceful ordeal—and we therefore on being called upon to give our evidence, acting under the best legal advice that could be had, declined to answer any question at that stage of the enquiry which might tend to facilitate a criminal charge against us—for the Coroner had now announced that the Inquest had been instituted to enquire into “an error of treatment,” but we both gave notice that if requisite before the ter-

mination of the enquiry we would put in statements on oath—this completely confounded the Coroner and the medical witnesses who were the promoters of the affair—and it was not till after examining the Resident Medical Officers and the nurses, and inspecting the case book and pathological journal, that they could make up their minds what charges to prefer. And in defiance of justice and established usage, the Coroner refused to allow our legal advisers in any way to interfere. He refused also to allow us to elicit any explanation by way of cross examination or otherwise; and he further refused to accept our statements or to take our evidence. At length, after a fourteen days' enquiry characterized, by scenes of uproar and violence, and by a defiance of justice and fair-play, which would have been disgraceful and discreditable to a tribunal of savages, *eight* Jurors out of the twelve, one of whom was a minor, and seven of them evidently in league with you and your Medical clique, came to a verdict which is altogether in keeping with the rest of their infamous proceedings.

“That David Bell came to his death in the Public Hospital on the 26th day of July, 1865, from two operations performed on him by the Ordinary Medical Officers, Dr. Izett William Anderson, and Dr. Lewis Quier Bowerbank, for diffused aneurism, while he was in reality suffering from circumscribed false aneurism, for which latter disease the treatment and amputation were quite unwarranted.”

Of such a senseless document, of course, the Crown Officers would take no notice, and there it, like Bailey's, remains a monument of the disappointed malevolence, ill-will, and injustice of all parties concerned.

I have no hesitation in stating that you were the promoter of this enquiry, and that you used the most disgraceful means to urge on the Coroner and the Jury. The Medical evidence as given by yourself and medical satellites, was evidently pre-arranged, and one after the other they followed their leader, in misleading the jury and enunciating opinions as to the history and treatment of aneurism, which were untrue and disgraceful. Thus it was affirmed by all of you that Bell's could not have been a case of diffused aneurism, as if it had been, he could not have lived more than 72 hours at the furthest.

That the detention of Bell from the 6th to the 22nd July, without operation, was injurious, and aggravated his complaint. That the disease was circumscribed false, and not diffused aneurism, and that therefore amputation was unnecessary.

That the puncture with the needle and the scalpel in such a case was unheard of—that such examinations were “outrageous, horrid and appalling.”

As one of the medical officers who attended Bell, I declare that no medical gentleman gave correct evidence, except Dr. Allen, and Dr. Somerville, and the latter did not see the examination of the leg or the body,

As one of the medical officers who attended Bell, I declare that the disease under which he suffered was diffused popliteal aneurism, and no other.

You, Sir, having acted a most conspicuous and disgraceful part

in this transaction—I have no hesitation in telling you, that your conduct has been most ungentlemanly and unprofessional—disgraceful to yourself, and discreditable to the College of which you are a Fellow.

You never having seen Bell and never having obtained a correct statement of his case, I have no hesitation in telling you that I think your daring to give an opinion upon it, is audacious in the extreme, and shows that you were actuated alone by a desperate desire to injure the characters of the present ordinary medical officers.

Your abuse of Dr. Allen was shameful and unprofessional, and on a par with your previous attempt to persecute him before a committee of the House of Assembly—his only sin being, his having been sent out as Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, and his practice there, proving more successful than yours and your followers had been.

As an additional instance of your conduct and veracity on this occasion, I will state, that in giving evidence, or rather in lecturing to the jury, you observed—

“That in the treatment of aneurism it is the established rule to lose no time in operating,” and you found fault because Bell had been kept in Hospital from the 6th to the 22nd July without any operation being performed—you stated that he had suffered in consequence—you then alluded to a case of your own, which had occurred in the Hospital during the previous year, and stated that “Edmund Wolfe was admitted into the Hospital during the early part of the year—he had a large aneurismal tumour in the ham which extended considerably into the calf of the leg—the man’s general health was very much impaired, and he had in addition to his aneurism, considerable ulceration on both legs,” this you repeated on re-examination on another day. You also mentioned that you tied the femoral artery on the 3rd June, 1864, and stated that you had strong and valid reasons for not operating between the 23rd February, and the 3rd June, 1864.

These valid reasons you are unwilling to extend to Dr. Anderson and myself in Bell’s case.

No, Sir, you here reckon without your host, you were trying to mislead the jury, forgetting that your evidence would be compared with the records of the Hospital.

I will now give you the real history of Edmund Wolfe as taken from the case book.

“New Ward,”

“Edward Wolfe, æt 70, native of Kingston, Jamaica, was received into Hospital on the 23rd February, 1864, suffering from aneurism of the left popliteal artery. The tumour in the popliteal space, was about the size of an orange and painful.—There was also an ulcer the size of a shilling on the left heel.—General health good.—Treatment, consisted of opiates at night when required, and generous diet.

Dr. Fiddes resolved that the treatment employed in this case should be that of ligaturing the vessel leading to the sac in preference to that of compression by tourniquet. Accordingly the consent of

the patient being obtained, on the 3rd June, at 3 p.m. he was placed on the operating table and chloroform given, Dr. Fiddes cut down and exposed the femoral artery and secured it where it begins to be overlaid by the sartorius muscle. The pulsation in the aneurism was stopped immediately after the application of the ligature. Forty drops of Battley's sedative to be taken directly, and to have an anodyne again at bed time if restless. The limb from the toes upwards was enveloped in cotton wool.

"4th June.—Has had a good long sleep, taken some tea and bread. The temperature of the foot and leg is natural. Tongue clean; at 9 p. m., all pulsation in the tumour ceased, has passed the day without pain, and is in excellent spirits. To have an anodyne draught to night.

"5th June.—Passed the night well, sleeping well, 8 p. m.—Has taken his food well throughout the day, suffers no pain in the leg, the dressing which consisted of dry lint and strapping has not been removed.

"6th June.—Passed a quiet night. No pain. The limb is every way comfortable, 8 p. m. Has continued well all day.

"7th June.—Passed a quite night. Feels quite well, a small ulcer on the heel dressed. This ulcer was present on admission.

"8th June.—Much the same.

"9th June.—The wound was dressed for the first time to-day with the dry lint and the sutures were removed. It was found that the wound had healed by adhesion; the foot is not quite so warm this morning; complains of pain in the heel.

"10th June.—Passed a bad night; says he has pain in the popliteal space; both the leg and foot are below the natural temperature.

"11th June.—Continues much the same.

"15th June.—Since the last report, the tumour has been gradually lessening and becoming firm to the feel.

"19th June.—The ligature is still firm, warm water dressing.

"20th.—A lotion of creosote was applied.

"24th.—Ligature still firm. General health of patient is good.

"30th.—Is doing well.

"July 8th.—Wishes to leave the hospital; says he is quite well.

"He was discharged on the 11th July 1863. Cured.

"(Signed)

P. FIELD."

On a Juror (Mr. Stines) requesting that you might be re-called, and asking you how you reconciled the different statements as to Wolfe's state of health on admission, as given in your evidence and in the case book, the Coroner and some of the Jury objected to the question as irrelevant to the case of Bell's death. You then, in an excited state exclaimed, "Oh, let him put his question I'll answer it." The question was then put. When you appeared confounded. You asked that your previous evidence might be read to you, and you read the case in the book. You then grossly insulted and attempted to brow beat the Juror, and demanded of him, how he dared to ask you such stupid questions, (all this was allowed by the Coroner.) After a while, you stated, that the man's health as represented at the

commencement of the case, in the case book was his condition at the time of the operation, and not at admission; and with this miserable subterfuge you were allowed to escape, and to declare that you would not answer such stupid questions.

I was never more shocked in my life, and I never saw a gentleman in a more wretched mess, in a more humiliating plight.

I hesitate not to tell you, that such conduct was mean and unprincipled, and that your object was to deceive and mislead the Jury by distorting the truth. If the Coroner had been honest and upright and the majority of the Jurors honest intelligent men, they would have stopped your further evidence, and have expunged all you had previously said.

In conclusion, I hereby denounce the unjust and illegal conduct of the Coroner in rejecting the explanation of Dr. Anderson and myself; but *he*, as I have already said, was a mere puppet in your hands. If, Sir, you had really believed that David Bell's death had been the result of improper medical treatment, and that we were, morally or criminally responsible for cutting short his life, and if we had been your enemies even to a sevenfold greater degree, than you have stated and profess to believe; nevertheless, if you possessed a spark of the honorable feelings of a gentleman, and of a member of the medical profession, you would have scorned to see us condemned unheard, and you would have appealed to the Coroner, to receive our statements, instead of urging and intimidating him to reject them. If you really believe, "that David Bell died through the commission of a series of the most horrible and appalling surgical blunders, which have ever disgraced the practice of a public hospital in any age and in any country." If you really believe that we (Dr. Anderson and myself) are responsible for David Bell's death, the opportunity is still open to you of charging us upon your oath, (instead of making cowardly charges in the Newspapers, and the Magistrates would be bound to receive your complaint;) and I tell you plainly, that nothing but your dread of the consequences of perjury—nothing but the certain result of such a course in your own ruin and disgrace, has hitherto restrained you, and is now restraining you from laying hold of so obvious an opportunity of carrying out your wish of "putting me on my back."

You, Sir, may write as much as you like, about "most horrible and appalling surgical blunders, which ever disgraced the practice of a public hospital in any age, or in any country." Such assertions may have their weight with ignorant self sufficient jurors—but, Sir, they will only bring you into ridicule and contempt with your medical brethren. As one of the responsible Medical Officers of the public hospital who attended David Bell, I have not the slightest hesitation, in spite of your lectures, and bold invectives, and audacious judgments, and in spite too of the miserable verdict, of *your still more* miserable Jury, in telling you, that all I did to David Bell, I would do again under similar circumstances, and in doing so, I should be guided by the practice of men like Sir Anthony Carlisle, Vincent, Luke, Lawrence, and a host of others—and not by your theoretical views.

Your envious and unchristian feelings towards Dr. Anderson as

well as myself, are further exhibited in the desire which you have expressed that the Bailey and Bell verdicts, will "humiliate" us. How this hope of yours will be fulfilled, does not, however, appear. If I may judge in this respect from many unexpected and very gratifying assurances both public and private, of sympathy and confidence, which your persecution has already elicited, I may at once inform you, that your expectation will be signally disappointed, and if reason had not been so blinded by prejudice, you might yourself easily have foreseen that these recorded verdicts could humiliate no one but the parties from whom they have emanated, and that the utterances of a Court, presided over by an officer who has proved himself a weak and unworthy instrument in the hands of unprincipled persecutors, may safely be left to the insignificance with which these Bailey and Bell verdicts have been already regarded by the Law Officers of the Crown and a discerning public. No, Sir, thank God, I am made of sterner stuff than you think; for I always try to do my duty in a straight-forward way—unallured by praise—and undeterred by fear. No man values the good opinion of the upright more than I do—and no man disregards or despises the abuse and enmity of the unprincipled more than myself.

One word more and I have done. You challenged me "to put my finger on a single statement, not strictly in accordance with truth," in your correspondence; and I have accepted your challenge, and leave the decision in the hands of the public. But, Sir, this controversy must come to an end—and I at least, have neither time nor inclination to engage in it any longer. Disgusted with the slanders and falsehoods which have been so abundantly published in some of the Kingston Newspapers, I have for some time refrained from reading them, and I am therefore, probably ignorant of letters that you yourself have contributed in this way.

I am informed however that you have accused me of writing anonymously or editorially in the "Guardian." This statement I once for all declare to be utterly untrue! and whether you really believed it or not, you were equally guilty of moral falsehood, in stating as a fact what you had no means of knowing, except through the medium of a suspicious and morbid mind.

I understand that you have also accused Dr. Anderson and myself of falsifying the records of the hospital. Such a base falsehood carries its own refutation. Your most partial friends will not give you credit for forbearing to substantiate against us a crime so easily detected and proved, if it had ever been committed.

If the government believed that there was one grain of truth in your statement, they would be bound to cause an immediate enquiry to be instituted. If I myself regarded your accusation with any thing but contempt, I would ere this, have taken steps to prosecute you for libel. Your presumption in daring to make this charge, astounds me, knowing, as I do, the real particulars of Edmund Wolfe's admission into the hospital, which was not for aneurism, as both the case book, and register assert. The presence of the aneurism was not detected for a week or two after his admission; the statement, therefore, that he was admitted for aneurism is untrue. Was *this* a "falsifying of the register?"

Sir, I again repeat, that there must be an end of all this, and the libeller and slanderer must be left alone to his own evil devices, and to the remorse of conscience which sooner or later follows as a terrible retribution upon those who follow the course in which you have so unhappily embarked. One thing I have to assure you of, if you think proper to renew and repeat your calumnies you will do so with impunity from me.

When you have retraced your steps and retrieved your character, I shall be ready to forget the past, and shall recognise with pleasure any good that may come to pass when the stir and ill feeling which you have evoked have passed away and subsided.

In trying to bring about reform in the Public Hospital and Lunatic Asylum, I had no personal interest to serve. I was actuated merely by a desire to correct the gross abuses existing in these institutions. The effort has taken up much of my time and substance since 1858. I have made many enemies, but I am happy to say more friends. The Lunatic Asylum I look upon, under its present management, with pride and satisfaction; the public hospital, though not so altered, is still in many respects better than it was.—My object is not to waste my time in wordy controversies with those whose paths I have crossed or whose plans of personal aggrandisement and greed I have frustrated; but to devote my spare time and energies to complete what I have undertaken.

“Jucundi acti labores.”—CICERO.

“The labours and difficulties through which we have passed are pleasing to the recollection.”

I am, Sir,

Your obedt. servant,

LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK,
M.D.F.R.C.P. ED.

ALEX. FIDDES, F.R.C.S., Edin.

Kingston, 4th October, 1865.

A P P E N D I X.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE PUBLIC HOSPITAL.

No. 1.

The chairman presented a statement, accompanied by several documents, which was read :

KINGSTON, 27th May, 1863.

To the Board of Visitors of the Public Hospital.

GENTLEMEN,

My acts, as a visitor of the Public Hospital, having been recently discussed and called in question by members of the board of visitors, as also by the medical officers of the Institution, I feel it my duty to make the following statement of facts, with the two-fold object : First, of showing that I have, in no way, exceeded my legitimate duties as a visitor, or been guilty of any breach of professional etiquette towards any of the medical officers of the Institution. Second, to point out the necessity which exists that the duties of visitors and managers of the different public institutions of the island may henceforth, as far as practicable, be definitely and distinctly settled and determined.

As you are aware, I am a member of the board of visitors of the Public Hospital, under the act twenty-sixth Victoria, chapter four, by virtue of my office of custos of Kingston, as also as one of the representatives for the parish of Kingston in the house of assembly ; and I was, on the 26th January last, at the first meeting of the board of visitors, duly elected its chairman. (See minute book, 26th January.)

It is a fact well known, that for the last four years and upwards, I have devoted much time and attention to the condition and management of the Public Hospital and Lunatic Asylum of this city ; and that since my appointment as a member of the board of visitors of each of these Institutions, I have done all in my power to advance their interests, by making known their imperfections and abuses, and setting forth their requirements, as provided for by the fourth clause of the act regulating the Public Hospital ; and, in doing so, it has always been my object to perform my duty in a straightforward honest manner, unallured by expediency, friendship, or private interest ; and undeterred by ridicule, abuse or insult. (See visitors' book of each institution.)

During the last session, certain members of the House of Assembly stated, in their places in the house, that the condition and management of the Public Hospital was now worse than it had ever been ; and one member gave notice that he would enquire of myself, as chairman of the board of visitors, in my place in the house, as to certain points of alleged mismanagement, in the Hospital. In or-

der to obtain the necessary information, I visited the institution on the 11th April last. I inspected the store-rooms and the different articles in store; the receipt, issue, and other books and forms; the kitchen department, tasting the food and witnessing its serving out. I also visited every patient in the institution, questioning them whether they were comfortable, and whether they had any complaint to make as to their treatment in the hospital, and telling them, if they had, to make it then and there, and not to go out dissatisfied and then grumble, and so injure the character of the institution unjustly. (See Visitors' Book, 11th April)

In thus acting, I felt conscious that I was performing nothing more or less than my duty as a visitor of the institution, appointed by the Legislature; and I knew from personal experience, that I was only following the plan regularly and systematically pursued in all hospitals, and other public institutions elsewhere, and here, too, in the best conducted institutions; and the only one I feel convinced, which is calculated to prevent abuses, and lead to the detection of those which exist.

I knew too, that in so acting, I was only complying with the letter and spirit of the law, under which I held my appointment; and was only carrying out the real intention of the rules and regulations drawn up by the Board of Visitors themselves for their own guidance, and adopted by them at their first meeting on 26th January. (See Minute Book, January 26th See Rules for Visitors.)

Besides all this, I knew too, that the public hospital was in a sort of transition stage, from the existence of gross abuses, to what I hoped was a better one. Nor could I forget that many of its officers, nurses and servants at present there, had been there under its former government, and that most or all of these had denied the existence of previous abuses, and might therefore again be unable to recognize their existence; and therefore I felt it my duty to afford the patients every possible opportunity of speaking for themselves, instead of letting them go out and complain.

On Wednesday afternoon, 29th April, I received a letter from a patient in the hospital, of the name of Allan McRae, of the date of the 28th, hereto annexed. Soon after its receipt, I went over to the public hospital and enquired of the porter in which ward M'Rae was; while he was looking through his list of patients, Dr. Somerville came out of the consulting room, and, on hearing who I wanted, he offered to take me to him. As we crossed the yard, I stated to him (Dr. S.) that I had received a letter of complaint from M'Rae, and that I wished to see him about it; and told Dr. Somerville that I would rather he should not be seen with me by M'Rae, lest he (M'R.) should be intimidated and refuse to speak out. I then went into ward, No. 8, and in the presence of the other patients and nurses, I enquired of M'Rea if he had written the letter to me; he said he had. I then told him to be careful what he did, as there was a stringent clause in the new hospital act (fifth) which provided for the punishment of persons making false charges. And I also reminded him, that on my questioning him on the 11th April, he had stated that he was well-treated, and had no complaint to make. I should have previously stated,

that on going into the ward No. 8, on the 11th April, I recognised, M'Rae as one who had given evidence as to the existence of abuses before the Hospital commission. I immediately called him by name, and asked him if matters were now better conducted than they were formerly ; he replied they were. He said that since he had told me so, another medical officer had taken charge, and things were now different in consequence. He repeated, that in consequence of the treatment he had received from Dr. Stern, he had written to me, and that he was prepared to prove all he had stated therein. I asked him if he was able and willing to make out specific and regular charges; he said yes, he would, if he had pens, ink and paper. These I told him he should have ; but again warned him, and all the patients in that ward, to tell nothing but the truth ; and in doing so, if they had complaints to make, to have no fear of anybody in the institution. M'Rae then said he would draw out his charges and send them in with a list of the persons who could prove them. I then went round the male and female wards, seeing and speaking to each patient, and being accompanied by several of the nurses and officers of the Institution. I told each patient, as before stated, to speak out if he or she had any complaint to make ; but to remember, and tell only the truth. I noted down the replies of those who made any statements. These are hereto annexed. It was very evident to me that there was a reluctance on the part of many to speak out, nor would some do so till the nurses and others in attendance told them to do so, and reminded them that they had complained of some particular article ; then some stated, that so-and-so was the case ; at the same time assuring me that they did not intend it as a complaint. I asked several if they had made any complaint to the doctors or to the inspector ; the usual answer was, that they had not. On my asking why not, for the most part I got no answer. A few replied they had complained to the nurses, or the doctors, but that nothing had been done. Some complained that what they got was good, but was not enough ; to all these I made answer that the doctors were the best judges as to what diet was the best for them ; that what I wished to know was, whether the diet they got was good, and whether they received what the doctors ordered for them, adding, that there was no doubt that some of them went out dissatisfied and abused the institution unjustly ; that I now asked them if they had any just complaint to make, if so, to do so. (See report of hospital commission, and memo. of complaints by patients.)

It will thus be seen that I did court complaints, knowing that complaints were made so soon as many of the patients went out ; and knowing, too, that, not very long since, to make a complaint was an offence, deemed worthy of punishment in this institution. There is no doubt that the listening to complaints is tedious and inconvenient, requires patience, and takes up much time.

On leaving the institution, I requested the warden, Mr. Cephas, to see that M'Rae was supplied with pens, ink and paper, and also to take care that in drawing up his charges he was not interrupted or interfered with by any one in the place.

The next day, Thursday 30th, about two P.M., I had occasion to see Dr. Stern at the Hospital, relative to another matter ; in the

course of conversation, I said to him, I suppose you know M'Rea has, or is about to make charges, some of which relate to you; he asked me what these were; I replied I knew not, as he had not yet sent them in; but that I had directed him to be supplied with paper; and that the best plan was to leave him alone, allow him to draw out his charges, which, of course, he would have to prove. I also, stated that I had been anxious to see the inspector and director about the matter; but that I had not seen him and could not then wait, as I was going over to Spanish-Town to attend the house of assembly.

The next day, Friday, 1st May, after my return from Spanish-Town, I sent over my servant to the Hospital to enquire if Mr. Trench was there. Mr. Trench immediately afterwards came over to my house and observed to me, that Dr. Stern had mentioned to him that I wished to see him. I then placed M'Rae's letter, No. 1 in his hands, and related to him very much what is detailed above; and I told him so soon as I received the charges from Mr. M'Rae. I should send them to him as inspector and director.

On the same evening, on my return home, I found a letter, No. 3, a series of charges, No. 4, and a list of witnesses, No. 5, each hereto annexed, lying on my table. It being too late to send them to the hospital that afternoon, and having engaged to finish some particular business that evening, I merely read the note, No. 3, and glanced over the pages containing the charges, and the list of witnesses, without reading them. I then wrote the annexed letter, No. 6, dating it as next day, the 2nd May. I then placed it with the other documents, in an envelope, which I directed to Mr. Trench. [No. 3, letter; No. 4, charges; No. 5, list; No 6, letter.]

The next morning I sent it over to the hospital, and received in reply, from Mr. Trench, the annexed note No. 7, in reply to which I wrote, No. 8, hereto appended. The same day, Saturday, 2nd May, I received the annexed circular, No. 9. on perusing which, I was struck by the following notice written on it, "to enquire into certain charges addressed to the chairman of the board of visitors by a patient in the hospital against one of the resident medical officers of the institution." As far as I could judge from M'Rae's letters, he professed himself ready and able to bring charges against Dr. Stern, the dresser, and against others, for certain issues of bad articles of diet, abstraction of extras, and serving out torn or rotten clothing. I must confess, I considered the latter charges as the most important, and I certainly felt surprised at their being omitted to be mentioned. — [No. 7, 8, letters and No. 9 circular.]

On the same day, 2nd May, it appears that the annexed note, No. 10, was addressed and sent by Mr. Trench to Dr. Stern.

In accordance with the circular, a meeting of the board took place, and soon after a quorum being formed, I stated the cause of the meeting being called; thereupon one member stated that, in his opinion, the charges could not be entertained, in consequence of their having been irregularly introduced.

Another member objected, to what he termed the "courting of complaints" by members of the board, as, in his opinion, wrong in principle, and inconvenient in practice; and alluded to a case which had occurred in the penitentiary between Dr. Anderson and Mr.

Hepburn; and, as far as I could understand, took credit to himself for having abolished this pernicious system in that institution.

It was however determined to receive the charges, and to enquire into their correctness.

Soon after the board had met, Mr. Trench handed me a letter he had just received from some of the patients in the hospital. As he gave it to me, M^r.Rae, who was then sitting on the witnesses' chair, made the remark, "that letter was written by one of the officers of the institution." Mr. Trench and myself agreed, not to introduce the letter till after the enquiry had been gone through.

Towards the close of the meeting, about three o'clock a letter, was brought into Mr. Trench, which he immediately placed in my hands. It was a letter annexed, No. 11, addressed by the ordinary medical officers of the hospital to Mr. Trench, and purporting to have been written previous to the meeting of the board. The letter was read and ordered to lie on the table. [No. 11, letter.]

On Monday, the 11th, the board again met, when the inspector and director announced that he had been requested to withdraw the letter from the medical officers to himself, and to substitute another; which letter he read. The board objected to this as irregular, and the first letter was thereupon taken up and read.

As regards this letter, I regret that it was ever written. I shall make no particular allusion to it here, further than to state, that many of the assertions made in it are contrary to fact, and are in direct opposition to this my statement.

The board then decided to proceed with the examination of the charges, thus ignoring the objections raised by the ordinary medical officers.

I have already referred to the letter and spirit of the act twenty sixth Victoria; to the rules and regulations drawn up and adopted by the board of visitors of the hospital for their own guidance; to the custom pursued in similar institutions elsewhere, and here too; and to the necessity of the case itself, as all authorizing and justifying, in fact demanding the action I took; and I have not the slightest hesitation in declaring, from my personal experience of this very institution, that if any other course of conduct is to be pursued, it would be far better to do away with the farce of appointing a board of visitors at all; and then, from my recent insight into matters, I feel convinced that the hole and-corner system of old, will soon be re-established in its entirety.

Let it be asked, what is the use of the board of visitors? why are they to be appointed? why does the first clause of the act provide that there shall be four medical visitors, two *ex officio*, and two to be appointed by the governor? Let me ask, are they put there as mere automatons; mere shadows; nullities; or as go-betweens, to prevent charges being brought against the medical officers, or, in fact, against any one in the institution, without the previous consent of the medical officers had, and obtained?

The act regulating the management of the public hospital in its different clauses, clearly and distinctly defines the duties of the board of visitors, of the inspector and director, of the ordinary and

resident medical officers; and where these several appointments are filled by gentlemen actuated solely by a desire and determination to perform their respective duties, with benefit to the public and credit to themselves, I feel convinced, that there need be no clashing or difference of opinion.

Before concluding, I feel bound to notice an implication made in the letter above referred to, from the medical officers to the inspector and director, in reference to professional propriety. It might be urged that here, there is no implication intended, that I have been guilty of unprofessional conduct, or so called breach of etiquette; but, unfortunately, there is no necessity to discuss this point. The conduct of one signing it has removed all doubt, if any could exist.

On this subject, I will merely observe, that in the performance of my duty as an official visitor of the public hospital, and in the execution of my duty in any public non-professional office I hold, I ignore altogether my professional avocations, obligations, and feelings; nor, on such occasions, will I allow my profession to be made a handle against me, by those who are displeased or dissatisfied with, or who fear my public acts.

As a professional man I love my profession; and I flatter myself, that I know my duty to myself and to my professional brethren, and I have always done my best to practise it. At the same time, I will allow no silly excess of such feeling, to interfere with my self-respect when performing public duties, however unpleasant these may be.

I repeat now, what I stated orally to the Board of Visitors and Medical Officers of the public hospital, at the adjourned meeting on the 11th instant. In all I have done in the present matter of the public hospital, I deny most solemnly that I have been actuated by any feeling, wish, or desire to slight, offend or injure any medical officer connected with the institution; nay, on the contrary, I can prove that in performing my duties as a visitor of the institution, I have over and over again expressed my anxiety and determination to avoid giving cause to any one to find fault with me on the score of interfering between the medical officers and the patients.

Again, in my official visits to the institution, I have studiously avoided all enquiry as to the ailments and treatment of the patients; and over and over again, when requested to express my opinion as to their care, or to look at their sores, I have declined, lest compliance on my part, should be construed into interference; and, lastly, when offered by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor the appointment of consulting medical officer to the institution, I refused it, because I felt I could not perform the duties of that office, and be at the same time an active visitor without clashing with the other medical officers.

Such is a statement of facts, I think it requisite to make to you, gentlemen, in answer to the statements and letters addressed to you, in which my name appears. I might prolong these by noticing subsequent insinuations and indirect charges, and offensive allusions to myself, made use of by one member of the Board, and of the Resident Medical Officers of the hospital; but conscious of doing my

duty, and being altogether regardless of such attacks, I shall pass them over in silence.

I have to request, that a copy of this statement may be furnished to his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, together with the other documents connected with this case.

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

LEWIS. Q. BOWERBANK.

An Official Visitor of the Public Hospital.

No. 1.

Public Hospital, April 28, 1863.

HONORED SIR,

I have to complain to you of the treatment that I am now receiving in this institution. The Medical Officer who attends to the ward I am in, I regret to say is ungentlemanly in his conduct both towards myself and other patients. The officer I allude to is Dr. Stern. He came up to me this morning, and instead of speaking to me in a gentlemanly manner, bawled at me as if I had been a *dog*. Such treatment, doctor, I am not accustomed to. My leg is also neglected by the dresser, and Dr. Stern never even looks at it; in fact I think it useless to remain here, if no attention is to be paid to me. I have also to inform you, doctor that the ale which I am allowed I very seldom receive; and at times ullaaged porter is sent to me; this is utterly impossible for any being to drink it. The gruel and tea are disgraceful, having no sugar.

I would advise your honor to pay an early visit, and take a walk round the wards, and you will find what I now say to be correct.

I can prove, your honor, that the patients are not well treated; they are neglected. They appear to make everything correct when you are here; but when you are away, everything is turned upside down; in fact, I would like to see your honor personally, and explain everything to you.

I remain, honored sir, yours obediently,

ALLAN. A. M'RAE.

Hon. L. Q. BOWERBANK, Chairman Com. Public Hospital.

No. 2.

MEMORANDUM OF COMPLAINTS BY PATIENTS, ON WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Peter Laffin, No. 3 Ward, complains that his porter was bad for two or three days.

Thomas Gibson, No. 1 Ward, complains that the sugar in his tea is not enough.

Tinker, new ward, states, that the food, a month back; was very bad; very much better now.

Masquitto.—Dinner often late; sometimes not till near two or three o'clock; the yams are bad; the soup is short.

Mears, states, that the ale was bad for two or three days; has kept a sample, which he produced.

James M'Dowell.—The ale was bad; in two weeks had less than seven bottles; bad and not served out. The tea has been very bad; the bread very bad; stimulants often not issued till very late; butter often rancid, and often too salt, filled with great masses of salt.

Briscoe.—Butter full of salt; ale was ordered, but could not get it for some days; the supply very bad; the tea is bad; does not take it,

George Bell Britton.—Tea and gruel not sweet enough.

Robert Stewart states, that the clothes are rotten, and that in sitting down his pantaloons tore; for which he was placed on spoon diet by Dr. Stern.

FEMALES.

Robina Coyle has complained of the malt.

Gomez.—The yams bad. It was stated by Mrs. Jopp, that in one day sixteen pounds has been bad.

Eliza Wright complains that the wine is bad.

Elizabeth complains the yam is sometimes bad. Mrs. Jopp states that the tea and gruel, not being sweet enough, is a constant complaint.

Eleanor Solomon.—Gruel was not sweet this morning.

Susan Baily.—Gruel not sweet; too much bone in meat.

No. 3.

Public Hospital, April 30th, 1863.

HONORED SIR,

I have sent enclosed the "charges" (which you told me to write out) against Dr. Stern and other officers of the public hospital. I would feel obliged if you would inform me whether they are put together correctly. Dr. Stern behaved very rude to Mr. Mears yesterday, because he told you about the sour ale that he received, and has also stopped his ale. He has also stopped my ale, on account of the complaint that I have made. He spoke to me this morning in a very rude manner. A lad, named Masquitto, in No. 2 new ward, shewed Dr. Stern some rice this morning, which was not properly cooked yesterday. He enquired of the lad if he ever eat better rice at his house; and told him to bag up the rice, show it to your honor, and used other insulting expressions.

I am, honored, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed)

ALLAN A. M'RAE.

N. B.—I have also enclosed a list of the witnesses I have succeeded in getting up. There will be a great many others to give evidence.

Honorable L. Q. BOWERBANK,
Chairman Comm. Public Hospital.

No. 4.

CHARGES.

Very little medical aid is rendered to the patients in the public hospital by Dr. Stern. This officer visits the wards once every day, merely giving a glance around, and seldom enquires of the patients their complaints; and when he does enquire, and is told, pays very little attention to them. I will now bring to the notice of the board a few particular cases, which I am prepared to prove,

The first case is that of a poor man named John Grant, who was admitted into the hospital on the 7th April, with some complaint of the stomach; the patient was under the treatment of Dr. Somerville up to Monday, 27th April, when Dr. Stern took charge. On the morning of Tuesday, the 28th April, Grant fell down from the agony of the stomach. Shortly afterwards, Dr. Stern made his appearance, stood up, gave a glance around the ward (No. 8), and was then going away, when his attention was called to the old man who was suffering from the pain. Dr. Stern went up to the man and said, "Oh, a good glass of rum will make your stomach all right." From that time Grant has been suffering from the pains, and he still remains without medical relief.

2nd—Henry M. Nelson and Robert Nelson have also been treated carelessly by Dr. Stern. Henry M. Nelson, though sick, was told by this medical officer (when he took charge of a portion of the wards) that he had better look to get home. Both Nelsons are from St. Ann's, and are brothers. Dr. Stern never prescribed one drop of medicine for these patients. They were both transferred on the 30th to No. D ward.

3rd—Moses Carter, admitted into the hospital on Tuesday, 29th April, for a dangerous disease, was threatened the next day by Dr. Stern to be discharged, under a plea that nothing much was the matter. The man immediately made it known to Dr. Fiddes, who told him to return to his ward and he would see about him.

4th—Thomas Richards has also been neglected by Dr. Stern. This patient is afflicted with a lame hand and a lame leg. Dr. Stern appears to be careless, particularly in ulcer cases, for he has been heard in No. 1 ward to utter these words: "I don't know what the devil I am coming in the ward for, for there are in it all a parcel of sore-foot and soor-faced people."

5th—When Dr. Stern visited No. 8 ward on Monday, I thought it right (as it was customary on that day) to open the ulcer for his inspection, but he never even looked at me; I was, therefore compelled to cover it again, and it was never looked at again until when I made a complaint about his conduct. His behaviour towards me ever after, I made the complaint has been *exceedingly ungentlemanly*.

6th—Dr. Stern speaks roughly to the patients, and in many instances puts them on "spoon diet" for any simple offence for three or four days. A boy was put on this diet because his pantaloons were torn, for two days; and the man named George Britton, was also put on this diet for about five days, because he spoke a little loud.

THE DIET AND LIQUORS.

1st—The diet given to the patients is not at all satisfactory. This, I must say is not the fault of the nurses, but the person who gives out the diet. The half diet beef is never without bones, and on that account the patients do not receive their due.

2nd—The liquors allowed by the Medical Officers to patients, are very often not given to them; sometimes a bottle of porter is sent to each patient who is on ale, and this, often so sour that it cannot be drank. I have often myself to go without my ale. On Thursday, 28th April, a bottle of ullaged ale, about four or five years standing in the store of the institution, was sent down to the new buildings for a patient; it was immediately returned to the storekeeper, and this officer thought proper to send it to me. I showed it the next day to Dr. Somerville, and also to Dr. Fiddes, and it was handed over to the dresser, to be thrown, I suppose, in poulitice.

GRUEL, TEA, COFFEE, ARROWROOT, AND RICE-WATER.

3rd—The gruel is very dirty, and is not at all sweetened; the tea, coffee, arrowroot, and rice-water are also to be complained of; no sugar scarcely is put into these articles, which makes them entirely disagreeable to the taste.

4th—Patients complain bitterly of the ragged condition of the clothing belonging to the institution which is given them to wear. The patients, many of them are to be seen walking showing their naked skins out. This is not the fault of the matron, for a quantity of new clothing are already marked, but no orders had been given to distribute them.

No. 5.

NAMES OF WITNESSES.

Henry H. Nelson, Robert Nelson, Robert Tomlinson, William Hobbins, Thomas Richards, Moses Carter, John Grant, James Christian, George Britton, Thomas Gibbin, A. A. Masquitto, Jas. Leveitch, Samuel Wallen.

No. 6.

North Street, 2nd May, 1863.

SIR,

Last Wednesday afternoon I received a note from a patient in the Public Hospital, of the name of Allan A. M'Rae, of the date of the 28th April.

I shortly after visited the hospital and saw M'Rae. I enquired if he had written to me complaining of the treatment he and others were receiving; he replied, he had done so. I then asked him, if he was prepared to make regular charges; he stated he was, if paper, pens and ink were supplied him. I told him he should have these; at the same time, warning him to be careful not to make any charge against any person which could not be substantiated. I, at the same time, told him and the other patients not to be afraid of

telling the truth, if they had been in any respect ill-treated by any person in the institution.

Yesterday evening I received the two enclosures, which I now forward to you, in order that you may enquire into the correctness of the charges adduced.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

L. Q. BOWERBANK.

Chairman of Hospital Commission.

To D. P. TRENCH, Esq.,
Inspector and Director, Public Hospital.

No. 7.

Public Hospital, 2nd May, 1863.

Sir,—I have had the honor to receive your letter of the present day's date transmitting two letters addressed to you by Allan A. M'Rae, a patient in the public hospital, with certain charges against Dr. Stern, one of the resident medical officers of the institution. It appears to me that a series of charges, such as those which Allan M'Rae has preferred, ought to be supported on oath; and as I have no power to administer oaths, I submit that the charges ought to be enquired into by the board of visitors.

If you approve, I will direct Mr. Duff to summon a meeting for Wednesday, or any other day that will be convenient.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

D. P. TRENCH, Inspector and Director.

To the Hon. L. Q. BOWERBANK, Chairman of the
Board of Visitors, public hospital.

No. 8.

North Street, 2nd May, 1863.

Sir,—When I wrote to you this morning, I quite forgot the fact you allude to in your letter of this day's date. I quite concur with you. Wednesday will suit me very well; and, I should think, would be a convenient day. It would be well to meet early, say half past ten.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK

DANIEL P. TRENCH, Esquire, Director and Inspector,
Public Hospital.

No. 10.

Public Hospital, 2nd May, 1863.

No. 72.

Sir,—I have the honor to transmit, for your information, the accompanying enclosures (in original, to be returned), embodying a

series of charges and complaints by Allan M'Rae, a patient in the public hospital.

These complaints were addressed, in the first instance, to Dr. Bowerbank, the chairman of the board of visitors, and by him submitted to me, for the purpose of being enquired into.

It appears to me, however, that the matter should properly be dealt with by the board of visitors, who, having the power under the act, may institute an enquiry, on oath, of the party aggrieved, and the witnesses whom he may produce in support of his complaint.

With this view, and for the purpose indicated, I have caused a special meeting of the board to be summoned for Wednesday, the 6th, at half-past ten o'clock.

I have, &c ,

D. P. T. Inspector and Director.

To Dr. STERN, Senior Resident Surgeon.

Moved by Mr. Levy, and carried : " That the explanation of the chairman, having been read to this board, the same be not dealt with by this board, but be forwarded, with the report, &c. to his Excellency the lieutenant-governor, as requested by the chairman."

APPENDIX No. 2.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE PUBLIC HOSPITAL.

" The report, as prepared, was then presented to the board by the Reverend D. H. Campbell from the committee.

The report was read and adopted ; Dr. Bowerbank dissenting.

REPORT BOARD OF VISITORS, PUBLIC HOSPITAL, 11TH JUNE, 1863.

REPORT—The board of visitors was convened on Wednesday, the 6th day of May last, to enquire into certain charges preferred by one Allan M'Rae, then a patient in the public hospital, and the enquiry was subsequently continued, by adjournment, to the following days, viz., the 11th, 15th, 20th and 28th May, and the 3rd and 11th June.

In conducting this enquiry, the board have been influenced, not only by a desire of affording the complainant the fullest opportunity of substantiating his charges, but also by the consideration of the newness of their own appointment as visitors, and that the present occasion is the first instance in which their collective functions have been called into exercise.

Believing, moreover, that true and reliable information, as to the internal and general management of the hospital under its present system should be obtained, at as early a stage as was practicable, they have thought that this end might be successfully promoted, by allowing more than ordinary latitude to the course of evidence brought before them, without strictly regarding the nature of enquiry into which the reception of such evidence might eventually lead.

In following this plan, considerable time has been consumed ; but the board will not regret this, if, as they hope, it shall appear, that the labor of their protracted sittings has not been expended in vain.

The board have come to the determination, that their present report should be strictly limited to the charges contained in M'Rae's complaint and to such suggestions, with respect to the economy and management of the hospital, as have occurred to them during the course of the enquiry ; and they have purposely abstained from offering any opinion or remarks on the questions raised by the ordinary medical officers, in their letter addressed to the board, as also in several other documents which were handed in and received at subsequent stages of the enquiry ; they are of opinion, however, that the duties of visitors, with respect to receiving and investigating complaints from patients and other persons affecting the hospital, should be, as soon as possible defined and promulgated, and they are prepared to make a special report on this subject, if required to do so by his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor.

M'Rae's complaint may be divided into two classes, viz. : charges of neglect and misconduct against Dr. Stern, the senior resident medical officer, and charges affecting the internal economy of the hospital and its subordinate officers, such as the improper issuing and condition of stores, diet, clothing, &c.

In reference to the former portion of the complaint embracing the charges, numbered respectively from one to six, it will be seen by the minutes of their last sitting, that the board have considered and decided each charge *seriatim*, in connection with the evidence relating to each case, and after having examined all the patients referred to in the complaint.

After a very attentive consideration of these several charges; the board are of opinion, that each and all of them are unfounded and unproved; the evidence adduced being, in the opinion of the board, insufficient to substantiate any one of the grounds of complaint as regards Dr. Stern. On the contrary ; it appears that almost all the patients, on whose behalf M'Rae has assumed to complain, have denied that they authorized him to do so, and declared themselves satisfied with their treatment in the hospital. The board therefore cannot refrain from designating the conduct of M'Rae, in advancing these charges as vexatious, if not malicious, towards Dr. Stern ; and they feel it necessary to condemn the serious impropriety of which he was guilty, in collecting his fellow-patients in the wards of the hospital, and instigating them to make unfounded or exaggerated complaints, with the evident design of giving color to his own accusations. Such conduct was highly irregular, and subversive of all order and discipline in the hospital ; and the board would recommend, that while every proper facility should be afforded to inmates of the hospital to complain of their own grievances, no patient should be permitted to constitute himself the medium of hearing and making complaints, on behalf of other patients, in which he has no personal concern.

With reference to the evidence connected with the charge No. 6, from which it appears to have been the practice hitherto for the

resident medical officers to alter or stop the diet of patients, as a means of enforcing order and discipline, the board are of opinion, that a specific rule should be framed, with the view of providing that such alterations of diet should, in all cases, be inserted in the journal, and not be continued for more than twenty-four hours, without the express sanction of the ordinary medical officers in charge of the ward.

They are of opinion, that for the purpose of preserving a correct record of cases in the hospital, and of enabling the medical officers, in case of any exchange of duties or otherwise, to know precisely the history and nature of each case in the ward, a journal should be kept by the resident medical officer, under the supervision of the ordinary medical officers, in such form, and according to such regulations as may be determined on for that purpose.

It appeared from the evidence in the case of Moses Carter, No. 3, that it has been the practice of the ordinary and resident medical officers to confer with each other, prior to the discharge by the resident officer of any patient in the hospital; the board would recommend that a specific rule, in accordance with that practice, should be framed, providing that no patient shall, in any case, be discharged by the resident medical officer, without the previous written sanction of the ordinary medical officer.

With respect to the other portions of M·Rae's charges, numbered respectively from one to four, the board have to report, that there does not appear to be any foundation for the statement, that the gruel served out to patients has been dirty, and they consider that the supply of sugar allowed for the hospital diet is liberal and ample.

No evidence has come before them of any instance in which the sugar has been abstracted; but as the taste of patients differs much in this respect, and the sugar, as at present distributed, might be abstracted before reaching the patients, the board would recommend that this be made the subject of future special consideration and regulation.

It appears that the attention of the Inspector and Director has been already directed to the undue proportion of bone which was found to exist in the distribution of the beef, and an allowance on the daily issues, to the extent of ten per cent extra of meat, is now made; but it is feared that this does not wholly remedy the evil. The board would recommend that the beef-steaks be contracted for separately, as extras, and not cut from the general supply of beef. The subject may be specially considered in the regulations to be made with respect to the diet.

It has been ascertained, that about the time mentioned in M·Rae's complaint, a quantity of new clothing was being made up and marked, previously to being issued for the use of the patients. On this subject the board would observe, that while strict attention must be paid to avoid the issuing of torn or ragged clothing, they cannot condemn the issue of old clothing, such as by being mended can be made fit for use, as the abandonment of such clothing would entail unnecessary expense. It is quite clear that cases have recently occurred, in which sour and ullaged ale have been issued to patients,

and porter has been substituted for ale, and, in some instances, the allowance of liquor ordered has not been received. These irregularities will, it is hoped, be avoided for the future. The inspector and director has already adopted a plan for daily visitation of each patient, by the purveyor, with the view of ascertaining that the allowances of liquor have been duly distributed and received. The board are disposed to believe that some of the irregularities adverted to, have occurred and may be, in some measure, excused, by the fact of a recent dearth of ale in Kingston, which occasioned great difficulty to the purveyor in obtaining the required supply for the hospital, from the insufficient storage room in the hospital, which has hitherto made it unsafe and inexpedient to keep more than very small quantities, at a time of the articles consumed, from the inability of contractors to meet requisitions at a short notice, and the consequent irregularity in supplying the purveyor's orders; and, lastly, from the newness in office of the present purveyor.

Beyond noticing the above irregularities, the board do not, however, consider it necessary to record any censure against the purveyor, or any of the subordinate officers connected with the hospital, against none of whom has any act or intention of fraud or dishonesty been proved. It will be sufficient to call Mr. Green's attention to the necessity of keeping the receipts of supplies from contractors entered up on the dates at which they are actually delivered; and the board would recommend that this duty be strictly enforced upon him.

In conclusion, the board would recommend that the storage accommodation should, if possible, be enlarged and improved, with the view of allowing the safe storage in larger quantities of imperishable articles, and preventing the necessity of frequent demands, on short notice, upon the contractors.

(Signed) LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK, Chairman, on behalf of
the majority of members, himself dissenting.

Dr. Bowerbank (the chairman) presented a statement to the Board, in dissent of the report now presented from the committee, which was read.

The statement was received; and the chairman requested that it might be forwarded to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor with the other papers connected with this enquiry.

APPENDIX No. 3.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF
THE PUBLIC HOSPITAL.

To the Board of Visitors of the Public Hospital.

GENTLEMEN,

It is not without a feeling of regret that I find myself compelled to dissent from many of the conclusions arrived at by a majority of the Board, and to differ, in many material points, from the report on the enquiry which has recently engaged our attention.

The difference of opinion I account for, thus : that hitherto, for a series of years, the management of the Public Hospital of Kingston as regards the relative position to each other, and the performance of the duties of the respective officers composing the Medical Staff, has been most anomalous and irregular ; but nevertheless, this state of matters has been represented to the public as what it ought to be, and the same as that pursued in similar institutions in the mother-country and elsewhere. Gentlemen, we all know how hard a thing it is to break through received or established opinions ; how difficult it is to correct abuses ; how prevalent and strong the impression is, that what has been, and still is, must be right. In such investigations, the non-professional visitor often expresses his diffidence in arriving at a conclusion upon what he deems a professional question ; at the same time, he feels himself bound to acquiesce in the opinion of the medical attendants of the institution ; the more so, if the practice in question can be shown to have been the custom, or to have prevailed previous to the appointment of the present Medical Officers. The questions in point are not professional ones ; they are questions of right or wrong ; questions of common sense. Now, strange as it may appear it is not the less true, that during my residence in this island I have met with very few medical gentlemen who really and truly understood the machinery by which hospitals are conducted at home. Nor is this to be wondered at, when we consider how few men comparatively speaking, out of the number of medical students, do obtain resident medical appointments in such institutions, and without which it is very unlikely, very doubtful, if any person can acquire a full, just and correct knowledge of hospital economy and management.

Attendance on the wards of a hospital is an essential part of the education of every medical man ; but sure it is, that merely " walking the hospital " in the train of a physician or surgeon, for an hour or two daily, or the mere holding of the appointment of a dresser or non-resident clerk, will never initiate or perfect a man in the knowledge of the systematic working of a hospital, nor make him acquainted with the peculiar and distinctive duties of a visitor, a treasurer, an ordinary medical officer or a resident medical officer or house-surgeon.

As a proof of the correctness of what I now advance, I refer to the contradictory and conflicting statements made as to the management of hospitals by medical gentlemen, as they appear in the printed report of the hospital commission, and also as they have been made at this Board during the present enquiry.

The harmonious and successful working or conduction of an institution of the kind, depends upon certain fixed and prescribed duties being performed by certain officers, and for the due and efficient discharge of which particular officers are responsible ; and on no account, except under urgent circumstances, are such duties allowed to be transferred or deputed to another or subordinate officer. So well established is this principle in the mother-country, so well defined are the respective and peculiar duties of each member of each grade of the staff, so confirmed are they by custom, that at the pre-

sent day printed rules and regulations for carrying out the same are obsolete, being considered unnecessary.

Surely, where a Medical Staff is intended to exist, and its respective grades are recognized, the institution should derive all the acknowledged advantages to be thence obtained. If not, why provide for it; why waste the public revenue?

I am quite willing to allow and to bear testimony, that the Ordinary Medical Officers of the Public Hospital here, devote a large portion of their time and attention to the institution; but I do say, without the slightest hesitation, as one who knows the duties and responsibilities of the several grades of a medical staff, that the Ordinary and Responsible Medical Officers have not hitherto, and do not now maintain that wholesome system of management which makes the hospitals at home what they are.

Why this system is not carried out here in its integrity, I cannot imagine. That the present act regulating the hospital intended it should be, I feel confident. Surely, because the discipline of the hospital here for a number of years has been allowed to fail and become lax, this need not *now* be continued, much less to be taken as a model.

Surely existing abuses or imperfections will now be remedied as far as practicable, and not be allowed to continue, on the plea that such has been the custom for some time, or that the Medical Officers are only carrying out the system they found existing when they took charge. Let it be enquired into by the Board of Visitors, why the system pursued in England, and which is here recognized by the law, and is evidently intended to be carried out, is still departed from in so many important respects, but do not perpetuate the mischief; or, by the appearance of your sanction, allow the public to infer that all is correct.

And gentlemen, in performing our duty to the public as visitors of the hospital, we have our parts to act, and the medical officers of each grade have theirs; and if all parties are actuated solely by a desire for the public good, for the welfare of the institution alone, there need be no clashing of authority, nor fear of undue interference the one with the other. The more correctly and strictly each performs his peculiar and appropriate duties, the greater will be that good feeling which ought to pervade every official connected with it, and the greater the success of the institution itself.

Gentlemen, in our prolonged sittings on this matter, we have heard much of "good taste" and "proper feeling," expressions of every-day use, and the meaning of which, in the mouths of many, is vague and varying. I trust my sense of good taste and good feeling is such as will render my acts what they ought to be. But, on a question of this kind, affecting as it does the welfare of one of our most important and costly institutions, and bearing as it does upon the happiness, health and life of thousands of our suffering fellow-creatures, I think the claims of so-called good taste and good feeling cannot be lightly urged against the dictates of strict honour, uncompromising honesty, and stern justice.

So opposite are our deductions from the evidence and documents laid before us, that I think my best and shortest plan is to

submit to you my opinion, founded on the whole matter, as brought before the board at its several sittings since the 6th May last.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK.

An Official Visitor of the Public Hospital.

Kingston, June, 1863.

The accusations brought forward by Allen A. M·Rae, in his charges and letters to the chairman, are two-fold, and may be divided into two classes.

First—Those affecting Dr. Stern, as senior resident medical officer; and Mr. Dawkins, the dresser.

Second—Those relating to the management of the institution, such as the issue of bad and insufficient food, the abstraction of extras, and the serving out of old, decayed and torn clothing.

After perusing the first class of charges, and carefully weighing the evidence adduced in support of, and in refutation of the same, together with the written statements put in by different parties, I am of opinion that M·Rae has failed in producing evidence to prove fully some of his charges; that he has, as shewn by the evidence of witnesses, exaggerated some of them; and that in swearing, as he did, that each of the thirteen persons whose names he had put down as witnesses had each and all authorized him to put them down as such, he swore falsely, evidence being produced that three or four only had so authorized him.

I would here observe, that patients who deny that they authorized M·Rae to put down their names as witnesses, still do not deny that they did feel dissatisfied at Dr. Stern's conduct, or that they did utter complaints. Hence it is but fair to suppose that, hearing these people grumbling, M·Rae knew they could, and supposed they would speak out. This, however, would never justify his false swearing.

In my opinion, M·Rae is deserving of censure, for having, on the morning of Tuesday, the 28th April, sat improperly or indecently on his bed during the visit of the medical officer to his ward; and again, for having broken the rules of the hospital, by going himself into other wards than his own; and also by instigating others to do the same, by coming into his ward while drawing up his charges; and then, on his oath, denying that he had done so.—Again, I consider that his conduct, after his discharge on Wednesday, 6th May (the first day of this enquiry being instituted), in holding clandestine communication, after dark, with the patients through the back windows of the hospital premises, after having been told he might have access to the hospital for the purpose of seeing his witnesses, was highly dishonorable on his part, and of itself calculated to cast discredit on his statements, and suspicion on his acts.

While thus condemning M·Rae's conduct, and willing to allow, after mature deliberation, that he attached an exaggerated impor-

tance to Dr. Stern's acts of omission, and free to confess that no evident injury or evil resulted therefrom to any of the parties affected, still, as one who, from personal experience, knows the duties and appreciates the responsibility attaching to the house-surgeon of a hospital, I cannot, dare not, but express my opinion, that the conduct of Dr. Stern was not what it ought to have been; and I conceive that he, by his acts, provoked the feeling of dissatisfaction among the patients, which gave rise to the letters and charges of M'Rae.

In my opinion, Dr. Stern showed but little care for his duties, or interest in the welfare of those intrusted to his charge, when for one, two, or three days after his return to the hospital (having been absent, on leave, for one month) he omitted, personally, to examine or notice patients in his ward.

All those who are said to have complained of such conduct or neglect on Dr. Stern's part, had been, up to the evening of the 26th April (Sunday), attended by Dr. Somerville, with whose care and attention they were all satisfied. On Monday morning, the 27th, Dr. Stern took charge. He went through the wards and took very little notice of any of the patients; hence the commencement of the dissatisfaction. In spite of its being Monday, the inspection day, and in spite of the sore being uncovered for *his* inspection, Dr. Stern did not notice M'Rae's leg, but passed through the ward. The patients were struck with the contrast of conduct displayed towards them by the two resident medical officers. They began to complain to each other; "murmurings were heard in the wards;" the patients comparing their present treatment with their past; Dr. Stern with Dr. Somerville.

On the Tuesday, M'Rae was found fault with by Dr. Stern for sitting improperly on his bed (justly, I have no doubt); but M'Rae, by this time, felt aggrieved. He considered that Dr. Stern had neglected him; and hence, perhaps, Dr. Stern's allowedly *quick manner* and *stern strict discipline*, appeared to him harsh, harsher, perhaps, than it would otherwise have done. It must not be forgotten too, that, at this time, M'Rae was under the impression that the dresser, also was neglecting his leg; he must therefore have been the more anxious that it should have been inspected by the doctor on the previous day, Monday. It appears in evidence, that Dr. Somerville saw the leg last on a Thursday, and that it was not again examined till on the following Wednesday, when it was ordered to be strapped. To say his leg got well, is nothing. Had his leg been looked after, perhaps, it might have been strapped on the Monday, and, in that case, he may have been discharged as an out-patient. From the evidence, it appears that ulcers are seen by a medical officer only twice a-week, on Mondays and Thursdays.

John Grant evidently, from his evidence, thought that Dr. Stern might have seen or noticed him on the Monday. He knew Dr. Stern; for he, on previous occasions, had been a patient in the Hospital. On the Tuesday morning early this patient fell down, or fell off his bed. Some hours after, when going round the ward, Dr. Stern passed him by without taking any notice of him. On seeing this, the nurse in attendance mentioned to the doctor, that Grant

was weak and had fallen down in the morning. Dr. Stern, we are told, turned back, and went up to him, and said " Oh, I dare say a glass of rum will do your stomach good." It does not appear that he questioned him, or in any other way examined him.

Dr. Stern is stated to see the patients in his ward at least twice a-day, morning and evening. This was therefore the third time he had seen Grant without noticing him.

Much stress was laid upon rum being the stimulus ordered. From Grant's evidence, it would appear that he did not like rum. We are told that, as a stimulant was required, good Jamaica rum was a very good one. Under the circumstances of the case, it appears to me, that some other stimulant would have had a similar effect, and would have been more likely to have reached Grant. Few about him would have accepted medicine from him, but fewer still would refuse his rum. I take it " the pain in the stomach," mentioned by M'Rae, was expressive of the breathlessness from which this man suffered on making any exertion, as when he appeared before the board to give evidence.

One of the Nelsons, without being examined, was ordered by Dr. Stern to go back to his own parish and take physic; and one of them was not examined till Thursday morning, in spite of applications for a repetition of his medicines, which were finished on the Sunday, and which had been prescribed for him by Dr. Somerville, and who again ordered medicines for him, so soon as he was transferred back, by Dr. Stern, to his Dr. Somerville's ward.

The reasons adduced by Drs. Fiddes and Stern, in their evidence and written statements, why these several patients were not sooner examined or noticed by Dr. Stern, do not appear to me satisfactory, or, in fact, applicable to the case. Some of these explanations might be received as an excuse, had Dr. Stern, after himself attending the patients once only, or, after having made himself acquainted with their cases and previous treatment, by a perusal of the journals, taken no further notice of them for a day or two, believing or knowing them to be convalescent and not to require his daily attendance; but let it be remembered, that Dr. Stern had been away for one month previous to his visit on Monday morning, the 27th April, and that Grant, the two Nelsons and M'Rae, had all been admitted during his absence, and up to the previous evening had been attended by Dr. Somerville. It appears that no journals are kept.

The excuse, that none of these persons were sick, and therefore did not require to be seen, or that they were not fit cases for a hospital, could not have been arrived at by Dr. Stern from his own observations; and, certainly, such an excuse comes with a bad grace, when we find the allotted amount of funds granted for this institution each year exceeded, and are assured that, on an average, seven hundred persons are annually refused admittance, many of them in consequence of want of room in the hospital, and when we find these diseased persons dragging through a miserable existence, and dying in the very streets.

The other charges against Dr. Stern, some of which have been much exaggerated by M'Rae, but none of which are totally denied

by Dr. Stern, all, in my opinion, arise from a laxity of discipline and bad internal management of the hospital, by which too much of the duties and responsibilities of the Ordinary Medical Officers have been allowed by them to devolve on, or be assumed by the Resident Medical Officers : such as the power of discharging patients, the placing patients on spoon diet as a punishment (a very questionable practice in well-conducted hospitals), the altering of diets, and the allowance and stoppage of extras, comforts, &c.

All these are duties which require discretion, and which belong to the Responsible Medical Officers, and ought always to be carried out by them, their directions being daily taken down by the Resident Medical Officer, in the journal at the bed side of the patient.

The Ordinary Medical Officers are amenable for the good management of the wards under their care, and the performance of such important duties therefore belongs to them, and to them alone. The performance of these duties, especially punishments, if deemed essentially requisite, if directed by them, comes with a better grace *their* ordering extras and additional diet, &c., is a guarantee to the public that all is right, and that in these respects, there will be no needless expenditure. And, again, the ordinary medical officers performing these duties, relieves the resident medical officers from much importunity, dissatisfaction, and odium on the part of patients. The performance of these duties partially by the resident medical officers is wrong, and is sure to give rise to unpleasant occurrences, and to unseemly clashings of authority, as in the case of Moses Carter.

The law distinctly directs, that the ordinary medical officers shall admit patients, and, therefore, by implication, they shall discharge them.

I was surprised to find, that when asked for, no journal was produced. This is a great omission, as the law directs it shall be kept, and that the ordinary medical officers shall see that the same is regularly written up by the resident medical officer. This document is a most important one in all enquiries, and, in its absence in any prolonged case, the evidence adduced on recollection, or subsequently written down, may be called in question. The register too was not written up. The only patient of those named, whose disease was entered, was M'Rae, who appears under the head of erysipelas of the leg.

There is no doubt that Dr. Stern has been in the habit of placing patients on spoon diet as a punishment; he himself allows it; and tells us, that although he ordered a patient on spoon diet for three days, yet this punishment would not be carried out, inasmuch as the nurse had directions not to keep any patient on spoon diet for longer than two days. Here then the order of the medical officer becomes an idle threat; a mere waste of words. This is a mischievous practice as regards the nurse. All directions in a hospital should be clear and distinct, and, when given, should be intended to be carried out strictly, without diminution or addition.

Formerly, in this hospital, persons who complained were punished by being placed on spoon diet; and from an expression made use of by two of the witnesses (Dawkins and Leivitch), there is, I

fear, reason to believe that this practice is not yet forgotten in the hospital. The medical officers state that they did not stop the extra allowances of any person who complained to the chairman on the enquiry of Wednesday, 29th April, for so doing; yet it is certainly a strange coincidence, that out of those who did so complain, some four or five had their extras stopped the very next morning, Thursday, 30th April, and amongst them M'Rae, and without any notice whatsoever being given to them of its being stopped. Mears's ale was stopped also, without his being told of it, although Dr. Stern allows he spoke to him with some asperity for having, on the previous evening, shewed the chairman a bottle of ullaged ale, which had been served out to him. When any changes are made in the diets of the patients, it is but fair to the nurses and other officers that the patient should be made aware of it. When this is regularly done by the ordinary medical officer during his visit, and the order is made in the presence of the patient, and the reason of it explained to him or her, all of which is at the time entered in the journal by the attendant house-surgeon, there can be no mistake, no misapprehension on the part of any person. If done as a punishment, it will then be known to the patient that it is meant as such.

After Dr. Stern was informed on Wednesday evening, that the chairman of the board had visited the hospital in consequence of M'Rae's complaint, and that M'Rae was about to send in charges, he was wrong to hold any communication with M'Rae on the subject.—He should have left him alone, and not have removed him from his ward. He should not have conversed with him, or any other patient on the subject, either in earnest or in sport. He should have refrained from all remarks on the subject in the wards. I consider his conduct in this respect to have been decidedly indiscreet.

Dr. Stern denies having expressed his opinion in the wards, as stated by M'Rae, relative to the sore-footed patients; but he allows he did make a remark to one student, as to the uninteresting nature of ulcers. It is well in the wards to avoid all such observations. Every one considers his ailment to be an interesting one. Such remarks may and often are misinterpreted by patients.

The expressed opinions of the ordinary medical officers, as made before the board of visitors, as to the efficient and regular manner in which Dr. Stern performs his duties in the hospital, and also their unhesitating declaration of his kindness to the patients, must be very gratifying to Dr. Stern, as must also have been the testimonial presented to him by Dr. Fiddes, as a token of his esteem and approval of the manner in which he had performed his duties in the hospital.

It would, however, be wrong in me not to notice Dr. Stern's manner or behaviour, before the board as also the improper tone of portions of his first written statement. As to his second, I hesitate not to say that, as regards facts, it is altogether erroneous, and is couched throughout in language as inappropriate as it was uncalled for. But, being personal to myself, I shall not further allude to it, than to observe, that if it is a specimen of Dr. Stern's so-called "mannerism," the less said about it the better, further than it is to be hoped that Dr. Stern's good sense will prevent his repeating it again.

The charge of M'Rae against Mr. Dawkins was not, in my opinion, proven. So long as M'Rae's leg was bad, there is evidence that he received from the dresser all necessary attention and care; but, as this officer had a great many cases to attend to, so soon as M'Rae's leg became better, he left it to himself to attend to. Such charges, for the future, would be best prevented by a note being entered in the journal, by order of the ordinary medical officer, when he considers patients able to attend to their own sores, &c. This, I consider, is but due to the dresser. As regards the second class of charges, these, in my opinion, have all been proven, except that as to the gruel having been dirty.

As regards the non-sweetening of the coffee, tea, gruel and rice-water, I think this is distinctly declared to be the fact, I conceive that if the sugar is of good quality, that the quantity allowed is ample; the present plan of having the whole sweetened in the kitchen before it is served out appears to me objectionable. This might be done by a nurse or other responsible officer, after its distribution to the wards. This person would readily become acquainted with the taste or fancy of each patient.

I was much struck by a statement of the dresser, as also by one made by nurse Green. When asked, if when the patients complained of the tea, coffee, &c., not being sweet enough, whether they had ever tasted it to satisfy themselves of the correctness of the complaint, they both replied no, that they had never done so; the latter especially adding, that during the four years she had been a nurse there, she had never tasted a drop.

There is little doubt that after the beef-steaks, as extras, are cut off from the joints of meat, for the use of particular patients ordered to get them, an undue portion of bone must remain to be divided into the ordinary diets. In saying so, I speak from what I have myself witnessed more than once. That the irregularities charged, as regards the serving out of malt of bad quality, and, at times, of the total abstraction of malt, are true, there can be no doubt. In fact, Mr. Green's statement expresses a recent instance of fraud and improper conduct in a patient, occurring as late as the 20th May. The contradiction between Mr. Davidson, the ward-master, and Mears, as to the offering and refusal of porter in place of ale, is strange, and appears unaccountable, and is certainly most unsatisfactory.

On this point, the evidence of Mr. James M'Dowell ought to be taken; as he too, is said to have refused it. This patient has, subsequently, complained to the board of the treatment he has received recently in the hospital,

It appears singular that further notice was not taken as to the issue of bad malt, as it appears complaints were made on this subject to three, at least, of the medical officers. It is also strange that with the exception of Dr. Somerville, as regards the female wards, the non-serving out of malt at all, appears not to have been known. Dr. Somerville in his evidence tells us, that on the female side, when the patients did not get, or could not use the malt served out, that only in one or two instances did he find it necessary to substitute another stimulus; that, as regarded the rest, it appeared

to him immaterial whether they got it or not. I would here observe, that the expenditure for stimulants, as spirits, malt and wine in the hospital, is very high, and, most assuredly, these articles should not be withheld where requisite, or be dealt out stingily; at the same time, they should not be ordered, except where positively necessary; and, when ordered, especial care should be taken that whatever is ordered, is given to, and is bona fide consumed by the patient.

The present purveyor, Mr. Green, who is young in office, appears to have made some blunders in the management of his official matters, and to have erred in not himself taking stock when he took office; but to my mind, as far as I can judge, in no case has anything like wilful fraud been brought home to him; nay, his blunders have been all against himself. In the matter of the brandy with Mr. Alberga, I think if Mr. Green had intended to be dishonest, he would have taken good care to remove the brandy supplied by Mr. Alberga, and which he stated he had not received. I think Mr. Green was guilty of great weakness, in fact, is open to censure, for having allowed the ten gallons of brandy to pass, when he states he only received seven gallons; and I think he was wrong in making up the difference out of his own pocket.

Since Mr. Green has been in office, he appears, from his own statement, as also from that of Mr. D. J. Alberga, to have acted differently from his predecessors, in condemning articles supplied by contract, and returning them to the contractors; as also in noting down all short weights, and in purchasing elsewhere during the non-supply of requisitions. To my personal knowledge, many of the articles of food supplied by contract, were of an inferior quality, and unfit for the use of a hospital.

The want of proper store-rooms obliges the purveyor to receive articles in inconveniently small quantities; besides which, this necessity often causes him to make too sudden a demand on the contractor for a fresh supply.

The present system of obtaining many articles by contract is, I think, mischievous, and requires to be well re-considered. (See my remarks in the visitors' book, on the 11th April last.)

I conceive that every contractor is bound to comply with the requirement of his contract. This it appears, Mr. D. J. Alberga has not done. Till he does so, in my opinion he has no right to find fault with Mr. Green's blunders.

The charge, as to the issue of old, decayed, and torn clothing, is certainly proven, some of the witnesses stating that they had seen the clothes served out in a torn condition. There is no doubt, that Stewart told the chairman, at his visit on Wednesday evening, that he had been placed on spoon diet because the clothes he had on were rotten, and had torn as he went to sit down. If this really was the case, it certainly is not right.

To my mind, many of the latter charges require further investigation, in order to elicit the truth. I would suggest that the house committee should do their best during their periods of visiting, to arrive at the truth; and that the inspector and director should use his best endeavours to correct the present system, which evidently

does admit of fraud being practised; beyond this, I would recommend that the resident medical officers, instead of initiating these several changes in diet, &c., should take care and see that the orders of the ordinary medical officers respecting them are duly carried out. Such is the duty of these officers elsewhere.

In conclusion, I would observe, that on no occasion would I prevent patients in a hospital from expressing their opinions as to the conduct of any officer of the institution, against whom charges may have been brought. At the same time, I think such documents should be received with caution. Thus, in the present instance, I consider that Laffin should have been called upon to state, who was the writer of the one he signed. Such documents, got up directly or indirectly by any officer of the institution, would be improper, unless he signed his name to the same. I still think too, that in every such case, it is the duty of the Board of Visitors, to require that a statement of the history of each person signing such document should be ascertained and laid before them—as regards the duration of stay in the hospital, the means of observation possessed by each, the treatment of each, as regards the allowance of extras, comforts, &c. More especially ought this to be done, where the rules of the institution are so broken through, that the peculiar duties of the ordinary medical attendants are performed by the resident medical officers, and where the letter signed by patients in defence of such resident medical officer flatly denies the truth of all the charges made, many of which are proved, on enquiry to be true.

Such is my opinion of the matter which has been submitted to the Board of Visitors. The investigation has occupied much time; but I feel confident, will result in good to the institution.

In my statement to the board already presented, I have expressed my opinion as to the course pursued by the chairman, being the proper and legitimate one, as also that this matter was properly enquired into by the board of visitors.

The sooner the rules regulating the institution are drawn up, the better; and in framing these, the intentions of the law will be best carried out, by adhering as closely as possible to the customs and practice of similar institutions at home.

L. Q. BOWERBANK,

An Official Visitor of the Public Hospital.

Kingston, June, 1863.

The Board then having concluded the enquiry, adjourned until the next quarterly or special meeting as may be summoned.

True copy of the minutes,

WM. DUFF,

Clerk to the Board of Visitors, Public Hospital.

Public Hospital, 17th June, 1863.

SIR,

I have the honor to transmit, by direction of the Board of Visitors, for the information of his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor,

copies of the minutes of the several meetings of the Board of Visitors, as also the several documents therein referred to, in a matter of a complaint of Allan A. M'Rae, lately a patient in the public hospital.

These documents are forwarded in original, in order to prevent delay. I have therefore to request that they may be returned, at his Excellency's convenience, for the purpose of being recorded with the minutes.

I have also the honor to enclose the report of the Board on the matter.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

WM. DUFF,

Clerk to Board of Visitors, Public Hospital.

HUGH W. AUSTIN, Esq., Gov. Secy., &c, &c.

APPENDIX No. 4.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE PUBLIC HOSPITAL.

A communication from his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, on the subject of the late enquiry into certain complaints made by Allan A. M'Rae, was laid before the board, and directed to be recorded on the minutes :

No. 1249.

Gov. Sec. Office, 13th July, 1863.

Sir,—I am instructed by the Lieutenant-Governor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th ultimo, forwarding, by direction of the board of visitors, as also the documents of his Excellency, copies of the minutes of the several meetings of the board of visitors, as also the documents therein referred to in a matter of complaint of Allan A. M'Rae, lately a patient in the Public Hospital, together with the report of the board thereon.

2—I am to acquaint you, in reply, for the information of the board of visitors, that the Lieutenant-Governor has carefully read over and considered all the evidence and other documents which you transmitted.

The impression left upon his Excellency's mind is, that the charges made by M'Rae might have been very properly disposed of by the Inspector and Director; and were scarcely of sufficient magnitude to require the intervention of the board of visitors.

The gravest charge, that against Dr. Stern, for neglect of, and harsh language or bearing towards the complainant, lost much of the weight which might otherwise attach to such an accusation, from the fact, evident from the commencement of the proceedings, that the complaint was preferred the day following that on which Dr. Stern resumed his duties in taking charge of the ward into which M'Rae had been admitted during his absence on leave.—There was consequently no time for any great amount of neglect by Dr. Stern, unless M'Rae's case had been a most urgent one, re-

quiring immediate or constant attention, but which, from the evidence of Dr. Fiddes, Dr. Somerville and Mr. Dawkins, it manifestly was not.

That there was no neglect on the part of other officers of the institution prior to Dr. Stern's return, or on the part of Dr. Stern, after the complaint was made, is apparent, from the facts proved by the testimony of the same gentlemen, that M'Rae had come into hospital with his leg in a very bad state; that he was convalescent at the time Dr. Stern returned, and that he was discharged, cured, a very few days afterwards.

With regard to harsh language or bearing on the part of Dr. Stern, there is no proof, except when M'Rae's own impropriety of position and neglect of the hospital rules, justly called for a reprimand and the enforcement of necessary discipline.

There appears to be an admitted quickness in Dr. Stern's manner (indeed, Dr. Fiddes terms it "mannerism"), which may occasionally, perhaps, be misunderstood, and which it would be better he should endeavour to tone down; but as far as the evidence goes, it bears strong testimony throughout, to his general kindness, care and attention. His Excellency concurs therefore, in the opinion of the board, that no sufficient ground of substantial complaint has been made good against Dr. Stern; and coincides in the view they have expressed, as to the impolicy of allowing any inmate to set himself up as the redresser of the alleged wrongs of other patients, or to go about from ward to ward, getting up cases of complaints or grievances amongst them.

Indeed, the Lieutenant-Governor is at a loss to understand how, if the nurses and other servants of the institution had done their duty, it could have been possible for M'Rae to have held the meetings, which he is alleged to have done, in No. 8 ward.

Whilst thus recognizing the favorable opinion entertained by most of the witnesses, of Dr. Stern's general kindness and attention, and admitting that no substantial grievance was made out by M'Rae, the Lieutenant-Governor is, at the same time, bound to express his opinion, that it was not right or becoming in Dr. Stern, on the first day that he resumed his duties (and that day being the usual one for examining sores), merely to pass through the wards without speaking to the patients, or enquiring personally into the cases of those who had been admitted as patients during his absence, even though informed by the dresser that those cases were progressing favorably; he ought to have satisfied himself that such was the case by a personal inspection. Moreover, a few kind words, a cheerful manner, and the exhibition of an interest in the patients, is often thought more of, and more valued, than service of far greater importance, when rendered without those concomitants of good feeling and consideration.

Before dismissing that part of the case, which relates to the resident medical officer, it is the duty of the Lieutenant-Governor to record his strong censure of Dr. Stern's letters to the board. The first, dated 20th May, 1863, is unbecoming in style and tone; and the second, dated 28th May, 1863, is most improper and reprehensible, as addressed by an officer of the Public Hospital to the board of

visitors appointed by the government to watch over and guard the interests of that institution. His Excellency has to require that Dr. Stern, in any future communications he may address to the board of visitors, will confine himself strictly to giving necessary information or explanations, and abstain from all irrelevant and unfitting comments.

The Lieutenant-Governor has also to express his great regret at finding that the registers were not kept written up, and that there were no journals kept, as by law required ; and his excellency requests that the ordinary medical officers will insist upon these duties being strictly attended to in future.

The other charges, as to an insufficiency of sugar, the occasional issue of sour ale or porter, the non-issue of any in one or two instances, the bad quality of the tea, butter, yams or other provisions, and the old or torn state of the clothing, though evils which ought not to have existed, or which should at once have been remedied, are comparatively of a minor character, and might readily have been enquired into and dealt with by the Inspector and Director.

Still, the Lieutenant-Governor cannot regret that the board has been subjected to the labour of conducting the enquiry in the present instance. It is the first occasion since the re-organization of the hospital establishment, under the new act, that any investigation of a general nature has taken place ; and its having been undertaken by the board will, his excellency believes, exercise a very beneficial influence. The immediate result of the proceedings was, naturally, to develop a good deal of the internal economy of the institution, showing the necessity of laying down some further rules for its general management, and indicating many of the particular deficiencies which thus require to be more specially provided for.

In thanking the board for the ability, patience and impartiality with which they have conducted the enquiry, the Lieutenant-Governor would request the board to crown their labours by framing and submitting for approval such further rules as they may think best calculated to carry out the suggestions they have made in reference to the punishment of patients who are guilty of misconduct in the hospital ; to the discharge of patients from the institution ; to the form and mode of keeping proper journals by the medical officers ; or to meet such other requirements relating to the internal economy or general management of the institution, as they may consider necessary to place it on an efficient footing, or likely to promote its general welfare.

In preparing these rules, the Lieutenant-Governor believes the board will find many valuable hints and important suggestions in the reports submitted to them by their chairman.

There is one point connected with this enquiry which the Lieutenant-Governor considers to require more than a passing notice, and relative to which, his excellency deems it his duty to express his opinion most unreservedly, namely, the manner in which the investigation originated through a member of the board of visitors. The medical officers of the institution have regarded this course as irregular and improper. The Lieutenant-Governor dissents from this view. What are the facts ? On the 29th April, a member of the

board of visitors received a letter, dated the previous day, from a patient, stating that he had complaints to make, and wished to see him personally. On complying with this request, the member of the board informed the patient that his statements must be in writing, and caused him to be provided with writing materials. On the evening of the 1st May, the patient sent in his written complaints to the member of the board, who, forthwith, very properly, sent them on to the Inspector and Director to be enquired into.

The medical officers, on the other hand, seem to think that all complaints should be made to the resident medical officers, to the ordinary medical officers, to the Inspector and Director, and lastly, to the board of visitors, in rotation. There can be no doubt but that in most cases this would be the natural and best course to adopt, and would generally ensure the speediest correction of the grievance complained of, if real; but it would not do to limit patients to this course of proceeding only. The object in establishing a board of visitors was to place the hospital under the inspection and surveillance of a body of gentlemen totally unconnected with it, who were not likely to be influenced by personal feelings or obligations, or by any of the considerations which may be supposed to bind men together, who are more or less dependent on each other, and connected with a common institution.

It was intended, in placing gentlemen to watch over the institution who were thus free from even the imputation of any common interest, tie or sympathy between them and the officers of the hospital, that the patients should have additional means of telling their grievances through those gentlemen, undeterred by fear, and uninfluenced by favor. The Lieutenant-Governor cannot consent to withdraw this safeguard, which practical experience has so often shown to be necessary. In framing therefore any rules for the guidance of patients in making their complaints (and which ought to be printed and hung up in every ward), it will be requisite, whilst recommending application for redress to be made in the first instance, to the different officers of the institution, at the same time distinctly to make known, that they are equally at liberty to make their complaints direct to any member of the board of visitors, or to the governor.

A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the Inspector and Director, to be communicated to the medical officers of the institution.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

HUGH W. AUSTIN, Gov. Sec.

WILLIAM DUFF, Esq., clerk to the board
of visitors, public hospital.

APPENDIX, No. 5.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF
THE PUBLIC HOSPITAL.

A communication from Mr. Secretary Austin, with an enclosure, was presented and read by the Clerk.

No. 1408, dated 14th August, 1863.

Gov. Sec. Office, 14th August, 1863.

SIR,

I am directed by the Lieutenant Governor to enclose extracts from a letter from the ordinary resident medical officer of the public Hospital, as conveying his opinions, in reference to points likely to come under the consideration of the board of visitors, in framing the rules for the hospital.

I am to add that his Excellency is happy to find that he was in error (as stated in my letter of the 13th ulto., No. 1249), that the hospital register was not written up, and that the censure conveyed upon the officer whose duty it is to keep that register, for this supposed neglect, is therefore withdrawn.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

HUGH W. AUSTIN, Gov. Sec.

WM. DUFF, Esquire, Secretary Board of
Visitors, Public Hospital.

ENCLOSURE.—Extracts from letter of ordinary medical officers.

Extracts of a Letter from the Ordinary Medical Officers of the Public Hospital, to the Inspector and Director of the Public Hospital.

A hospital register is kept, a summary of which is annually forwarded to the two branches of the Legislature. There is also a dietary register which is written up daily ; but to keep a journal, in which the full medical or surgical history of every case received into the hospital is to be daily chronicled from beginning to end, is one of the crudities and impracticable measures embodied in the present hospital act.

To carry out such a requirement is an impossibility ; nor can we perceive that any benefit would accrue, either to science or to humanity, by the literal fulfilment of this provision of the act. All that can be reasonably expected from the two resident surgeons, whose duty it is to write such a journal is, that they should furnish the history of the most interesting and important cases in the hospital, such as may be considered by the visiting officers as specially worthy of being recorded in the case-books.

Unless an alms-house or asylum be established in this city for the reception of the destitute, the public hospital must unavoidably continue to receive many persons, suffering more from want and starvation than from actual disease.

Some of these come from a far distance, and are deposited in the receiving room; and it is not unfrequently necessary to admit them in the institution, even though they be improper subjects for it, merely to prevent their dying in the street.

Although we are necessarily obliged to depute many of the details, of the hospital practice to the resident surgeons, we do not consider that this circumstance forms any legitimate ground of complaint.

We see no reason to reduce the position of these gentlemen to a nonentity, by our taking the entire details of hospital duty into our own hands, nor does the hospital law enjoin so impracticable an arrangement. In regulating the dietary and discharging patients, the resident medical officers act under the direction and supervision of the visiting medical officers; and so long as there exist a good understanding and mutual co-operation between the respective members of the staff, we see no reason to denude the resident medical officers of all their delegated functions. To establish an absolute rule, that a patient's diet should neither be ordered nor altered, but by the visiting medical officer, could only have the effect of embarrassing the working of the hospital machinery, and impairing its efficiency.

With regard to the punishment of its refractory patients, by means of a temporary alteration or lowering of their diet, upon which Dr. Bowerbank has laid so much stress, we can only say that this mode of punishment is really the only one available in most instances. Dr. Bowerbank believes summary dismissal to be the legitimate mode of dealing with refractory patients; but such a view is clearly untenable; for it is obvious that cases will occur, in which, although a dietary punishment might be temporarily and wholesomely administered, yet the summary ejection of the patient from the hospital would be nothing short of cruelty.

We readily admit that the amount of stimulants consumed is apparently high; but if the condition of a large proportion of the patients is duly considered, this will not be a matter for surprise.

Many of the inmates of the institution are admitted in an enfeebled and broken down condition, requiring the free use of these agents as a means to their recovery. Whether liquors be *always* consumed by the patients for whom they have been prescribed, or whether they may be handed over sometimes from one patient to another, is a point upon which a reasonable doubt may arise, and upon which we cannot speak either affirmatively or negatively. All we can say is, that to the best of our recollection, such misconduct has never come before us, or been lodged as a ground for complaint against any patient, or nurse or under-officer.

Since our connection with the hospital, the register has never been behind. The diseases of patients are entered as soon as the patients are discharged; and we can positively affirm that the register was duly written up at the period of the investigation into M'Rae's charges, when Dr. Bowerbank inspected it.

The M'Rae who appeared as a witness in the late enquiry was not the Robert Thompson M'Rae, aged ten years, who was dis-

charged from the hospital on the 24th April, nearly two weeks before the institution of this investigation, and who had been admitted for an erysipelas of the leg.

Dr. Bowerbank recorded his dissent to the statements made by the ordinary medical officers, as to the register and case-book.

Adjourned to Tuesday, the 25th instant.

True copy,

WM. DUFF, Clerk.

APPENDIX No. 6.

EXTRACT FROM THE EVIDENCE OF MR. FIDDES, BEFORE A COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, AS PUBLISHED IN THE VOTES OF THE HOUSE FOR 1863-64. SEE APPENDIX No. 36 OF THAT DOCUMENT.

Examination of ALEXANDER FIDDES, Esquire, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh, was this day resumed, before the Committee appointed to visit and inspect the Public Hospital of Kingston, &c.

Question—A statement, relative to the hospital management, dated in June last, now before the Committee, is said to have been laid before the board of visitors of the Kingston hospital by the Chairman; if so, did you see it?

Answer—Yes.

Q—Did you make any reply to, or observations upon that statement; and, if so, have you any objection to lay it before the committee?

A—Dr. Dunn and myself did reply to that statement, in a letter addressed to his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, dated, I think, in July, 1863. I have a copy of said letter, and will lay it before this committee, if it be required.

A. FIDDES.

Public Hospital, 25th July, 1863.

Sir,—The enquiry instituted by the board of visitors into the charges preferred by the patient Alan A M'Rae, against Dr. Stern, having terminated, and the official report thereon, with the documentary evidence adduced at the investigation, having been forwarded to government, it would be unnecessary for us to offer any further observations on the subject than we have already made in two letters, which we laid before the board of visitors during its late sitting to investigate the charges of M'Rae.

But as Dr. Bowerbank has dissented from the decision of the board, and given a statement or report of his own, in which he has not only differed from the conclusions of the board with regard to the testimony adduced at the investigation, but has also advanced numerous allegations against the present direction of the hospital, we must ask permission to make a few comments on the extraordinary statements which he has furnished; and, in dealing with it, though we have experienced no trouble from the force of any positive assertion which Dr. Bowerbank has advanced, yet we are free to admit that we have received considerable vexation, from the peculiar way in which insinuations and inuendos have been disingenuously put forward in the room of substantive statements.

Divested of the verbiage in which Dr. Bowerbank's charges are enveloped, they may be classed and arranged under a few heads; but, before answering these seriatim, it may be right to notice his prefatory remarks with regard to the particular class of medical men whom, he believes, thoroughly understand the machinery by which hospitals are conducted in the Mother-country, and by means of which they should be managed here.

In this portion of his letter, Dr. Bowerbank desires to make it appear that, during the period which has elapsed since his arrival in this colony, he has met with very few medical men who have had a proper conception of the conduction and management of public hospitals, or who have had the necessary professional education to qualify them for the discharge of such duty; and the inference which he wishes to convey evidently is, that he himself, by his early training and subsequent professional advantages, has been, and is alone capable of understanding and undertaking the duties of so important a trust.

However this may be, we cannot but express our regret that the medical profession of Jamaica have not received some more tangible revelation of Dr. Bowerbank's extraordinary knowledge of the economy of hospitals than the bare announcement conveyed in his own proclamation of it.

Were it necessary to express our opinion on the point here involved, we would have no difficulty in enumerating the names of medical men who formerly lived, and of not a few who still live in this country, whose theoretical and practical acquaintance with hospitals is probably more accurate and comprehensive than that of Dr. Bowerbank. But such invidious comparisons would be beside the question; and we would not say more on this subject than merely to observe that the higher and more difficult professional duties which devolve on the responsible officers of a large public hospital, require a degree of medical knowledge and surgical skill, which can be found in a limited number only of the profession.

We would further observe, that the qualities of the head and of the hand which fit some men for the efficient discharge of the important and practical requirements of hospital service, are very different from that peculiar medical talent, which would appear to consist chiefly, in detecting imaginary faults in hospital arrangements, in contorting evidence and testimony, and in writing commentaries thereon. Some professional men excel in the first of these qualifications; others evince a genius for the second; but probably, remarkable attainments in both, are never found associated in one individual.

The gist of Dr. Bowerbank's charges against the present medical direction of the hospital, so far as we are enabled to gather from the wordy and desultory document which he has presented to the Board of Visitors, may be comprised in a short summary. They are:—

Firstly—The existence of abuses and imperfections in the medical and surgical management, and lax discipline over the inmates of the institution.

With reference to this allegation, we have to observe that there

may have been short-comings and imperfections in our management, and that we have never laid claim to perfectability; at the same time, we are confident, that we and the other medical officers have done all they could do to work the machinery of the institution and preserve discipline among the inmates. It was only from an earnest desire that the discipline of the establishment should be maintained, that we objected formally, to the manner of Dr. Bowerbank's interference with M'Rae, believing that such interference was irregular, and calculated to subvert discipline.

Secondly—A special charge against the medical staff for neglecting ulcers, and seeing these only twice a week.

In regard to this sweeping statement of Dr. Bowerbank, we have to remark, that nothing could be more unfair and disingenuous. The fact is, that the periods for the inspection of ulcers must always be regulated by their nature and character. Some ulcers may require examination two or three times daily, whilst others, if of simple character and in a healthy and healing condition, may not require any special interference oftener than once in every three or four days. There are, and may be many cases in which the nurses, the dresser or the patient himself, may adequately afford the attention required; and although it is a standing rule of the hospital, that every ulcer must be inspected by the medical officers twice a-week, still this rule does not prevent the more frequent examination of sores when their condition may appear to require it.

Thirdly—That no medical journal is kept.

In answering this charge, we have to observe, that a hospital register is kept, a summary of which is annually forwarded to the two branches of the legislature. There is also a dietary register which is written up daily. But to keep a journal, in which the full medical or surgical history of every case received into the hospital is to be daily chronicled, from beginning to end, is one of the erudite and impracticable measures embodied in the present hospital act. To carry out such a requirement is an impossibility; nor can we perceive that any benefit would accrue, either to science or humanity, by the literal fulfilment of this provision of the act. All that can be reasonably expected from the two resident surgeons, whose duty it is to write such a journal, is, that they should furnish the history of the most interesting and important cases in the hospital, such as may be considered by the visiting officers as specially worthy of being recorded in the case-books.

Fourthly—That persons are received into the hospital who do not require medical or surgical treatment, whilst several hundred patients are annually refused admission.

This allegation is, in some measure just; but unless an almshouse or asylum be established in the city for the reception of the destitute, the public hospital must unavoidably continue to receive many persons suffering more from want and starvation than from actual disease. Some of these come from a far distance, and are deposited in the receiving room; and it is not unfrequently necessary to admit them in the institution, even though they be improper subjects for it, merely to prevent their dying in the street.

Fifthly—That some of the duties which should be performed by the ordinary visiting medical officers are deputed to the resident surgeons, such as the discharging of patients, the regulation of the dietary, and the punishment of unruly or refractory patients, by altering or lowering their diet.

In meeting this charge, we have only to remark, that although we are necessarily obliged to depute many of the details of the hospital practice to the resident surgeons, we do not consider that this circumstance forms any legitimate ground of complaint. We see no reason to reduce the position of these gentlemen to a nonentity, by our taking the entire details of hospital duty into our own hands, nor does the hospital law enjoin so impracticable an arrangement. In regulating the dietary and discharging patients, the resident medical officers act under the direction and supervision of the visiting medical officers; and so long as there exists a good understanding and mutual co-operation between the respective members of the staff, we see no reason to denude the resident medical officers of all their delegated functions. To establish an absolute rule, that a patient's diet should neither be ordered nor altered but by the visiting medical officers, could only have the effect of embarrassing the working of the hospital machinery, and impairing its efficiency.

With regard to our punishment of refractory patients, by means of a temporary alteration or lowering of their diet, upon which Dr. Bowerbank has laid so much stress, we can only say, that this mode of punishment is really the only one available in most instances. Dr. Bowerbank believes summary dismissal to be the legitimate mode of dealing with refractory patients; but such a view is clearly untenable; for it is obvious that cases will occur, in which, although a dietary punishment might be temporarily and wholesomely administered, yet the summary ejection of the patient from the hospital would be nothing short of cruelty.

Sixthly—That the consumption of wine, spirits, and malt liquors is too high, and that these stimulants are not always consumed *bona fide* by the patients for whom they have been ordered.

In reply to this charge, we readily admit that the amount of stimulants consumed is apparently very high; but if the condition of a large proportion of the patients is duly considered, this will not be a matter for surprise. Many of the inmates of the institution are admitted in an enfeebled and broken down condition, requiring the free use of these agents as a means to their recovery. Whether liquors be *always* consumed by the patients for whom they have been prescribed, or whether they may be handed over sometimes from one patient to another, is a point upon which a reasonable doubt may arise, and upon which we cannot speak either affirmatively or negatively. All we can say is, that to the best of our recollection, such misconduct has never come before us, or been lodged as a ground for complaint against any patient, or nurse, or under officer.

Seventhly—A special charge of neglect against the medical officers in their attendance on M'Rae's leg, upon the two Nelsons, and in the case of Grant.

Upon the treatment which M·Rae received in the hospital, we have only to remark, that his testimony, and that of the witnesses whom he brought forward at the investigation, has been furnished at length, and we trust will speak for itself. We would only call attention to the fact, that this patient entered the hospital on the 4th April, suffering from a sloughing ulcer of the leg, so extensive in dimension as to make it problematical whether amputation of the limb might not be necessary, and that he was sufficiently well to leave the institution on the 6th May following, the sore being then nearly healed.

As to Dr. Bowerbank's charges of neglect in the case of the two brothers, Nelson, we can also appeal to the testimony which they themselves furnished, and to that supplied by the sworn witnesses who gave evidence on their case. These men were in no way neglected, as Dr. Bowerbank has averred. One of the brothers came into the hospital for an affection of the eye, of which he was speedily cured; and, curiously enough, both brothers labored under a morbid irritability of the nervous system, like hypochondriacism, or slight mental derangement. Dr. Stern's recommendation to one of them "to go into the country and take physic," was by no means an injudicious advice, nor was there any impropriety on the part of this officer in not giving the other brother as much medicine as he desired; in fact, he required little or none; and all that was necessary to do for him in this way, when he was transferred to Dr. Somerville's ward, was once ordering him a little simple medicine for temporary acidity of the stomach.

In regard to the alleged neglect and improper treatment in John Grant's case, it may not be improper to quote Dr. Bowerbank's own observations, as these may be taken as a good example of the unfair method adopted by him in dealing with ordinary occurrences in the hospital. He says, "that Grant thought that Dr. Stern might have seen or noticed him on the Monday. He knew Dr. Stern, for he had been, on previous occasions, a patient in the hospital. On the Tuesday morning early this patient fell down, or fell off his bed. Some hours after, when going round the ward, Dr. Stern passed him by without taking any notice of him. On seeing this, the nurse in attendance mentioned to the doctor that Grant was weak, and had fallen down in the morning. Dr. Stern, we are told, turned back and went up to him, and said, 'Oh! I dare say a glass of rum will do your stomach good.' It does not appear that he questioned him, or in any way examined him. Dr. Stern is stated to see the patients in his ward at least twice a-day, morning and evening. This was therefore the third time he had seen Grant without noticing him. Much stress was laid upon rum being the stimulant ordered. From Grant's evidence, it would appear that he did not like rum. We are also told that as a stimulant was required, good Jamaica rum was a very good one. Under the circumstances of the case, it appears that some other stimulant would have had a similar effect, and would have been more likely to have reached Grant. Few about him would have accepted medicine from him, but fewer still would have refused his rum. I take it, the pain in the stomach mentioned by M·Rae, was expressive of the breathlessness from which the man suffered

on making any exertion, as when he appeared before the board of visitors."

With reference to this laboured attempt of Dr. Bowerbank's to make something out of nothing, we have to observe that Grant was admitted into the hospital on the 7th April, 1863. He was received and examined, on his admission, by Dr. Fiddes, who ascertained that he was suffering chiefly from the effects of starvation and from debility; that he required rest and nutritious food, rather than physic. This view of his case was thereupon communicated to the resident surgeon, who placed him forthwith on a liberal diet. When Dr. Stern resumed his official duties on Monday, the 27th April, he had no occasion to alter this patient's treatment. Grant was taking no medicine, and he was not one of those pointed out by the visiting medical officer as requiring any special interference; but when he, Dr. Stern, was informed by the nurse that Grant had fallen whilst getting off his bed, he very properly ordered him five ounces of rum daily as a stimulant. Rum being cheaper than brandy, and more potent than wine, was really the most eligible stimulant for the necessities of this case; yet, Dr. Bowerbank asserts, that "some other stimulant would have had a similar effect, and would have been much more likely to have reached Grant." In thus finding fault with the practice of a responsible medical officer of the hospital, Dr. Bowerbank has clearly overstepped his duty as a visitor; and in insinuating that, perhaps, Grant might have been robbed of his stimulant, he has not acted in good faith. Grant was examined, on oath, by the board of visitors, and Dr. Bowerbank could then have ascertained whether he really received the rum which had been ordered for him. It surely would have been better to have taken the patient's evidence on this question, than to have left it open for the subsequent expression of doubt.

Eighthly—That the hospital register was not written up, and that he, M'Rae, appears therein under the head of erysipelas of the leg.

This statement of Dr. Bowerbank is not correct. Since our connection with the hospital, the register has never been behind. The diseases of patients are entered as soon as the patients are discharged; and we can positively affirm, that the register was duly written up at the period of the investigation into M'Rae's charges, when Dr. Bowerbank inspected it. Had he not permitted the promptings of his imagination to obscure the accuracy of his visual examination, he would have perceived that the M'Rae, who appeared as a witness in the last enquiry, was not the Robert Thompson M'Rae, aged ten years, who was discharged from the hospital on the 24th April, nearly two weeks before the institution of this investigation, and who had been admitted for an erysipelas of the leg. It appears that in this matter of the register, Dr. Bowerbank has departed somewhat from his usual cautious style of insinuation. A hint thrown out that all was not right, or the emission of a conjecture that something was wrong, would have been safer practice in this instance than that which he has followed, and might have answered his purpose fully as well.

Dr. Bowerbank, in the concluding portion of his letter, observes, that the evidence of James M'Dowell, lately a patient in the hospital, should have been taken, as he had made a complaint to the board against the treatment which he had received in the institution. Why M'Dowell's testimony was not taken, nor his complaint investigated, we cannot explain, though the reason for such omission is probably known to Dr. Bowerbank himself. We hope we may be permitted to supply the omission of M'Dowell's evidence, by relating the history and main particulars of his case.

M'Dowell, *who was a patient of Dr. Bowerbank*, applied for admission in the hospital on 6th March, 1863. When received, he was found to be suffering from a complication of disease of a very painful and distressing character. Having a narrow and seemingly impermeable stricture, the urethra had given way, producing abscesses and fistulus apertures, through which nearly all his urine dribbled away. This source of irritation had caused a great degree of thickening and induration of the textures involved, and perpetuated a condition attended by local pain and constitutional disturbance. Though received as a patient, who was not to pay hospital dues, he was not placed in an ordinary ward, but was accommodated with a private room. After a few trials, and not without considerable trouble and difficulty, a catheter was introduced in the bladder, and, from this time, his recovery was progressive and satisfactory. The urethra, dilated to its healthy calibre, the sinuses healed, the indurations and swellings disappeared, and the general health proportionately improved. During the course of these beneficial changes, and particularly towards their termination in recovery, M'Dowell was loud in the expression of his thanks and gratitude for kindness received and benefits conferred. It was only towards the end of his hospital residence, and during the enquiry into M'Rae's charges, that M'Dowell so far forgot his obligations, as to make a written statement that he had been badly used. His charges were never officially brought forward, but, if they had, they would have been satisfactorily disposed of. M'Dowell left the hospital on the 20th May, relieved of his disease, and never did a patient leave the institution with more reason for satisfaction and less ground for complaint. It is probably unnecessary that we should say anything further in answer to Dr. Bowerbank's allegations. We have fairly and honestly noticed them as a matter of justice to ourselves, and we leave it with government to determine how far the said allegations may be justifiable. If it should appear that these are well founded, and that the ordinary visiting medical officers have neither sufficient ability nor sufficient probity to conduct the management of the institution, it would be preferable that they retire from it, rather than remain in a situation in which their services could be neither advantageous to the public, nor creditable to themselves. If, on the other hand, the government be satisfied with their conduct, and desire a continuation of their services, then it is desirable that they should be allowed fair pay. Dr. Bowerbank stated at one of the meetings of the board of visitors, that in the exercise of his official duty, his conduct would not be regulated by any regard for what is termed professional etiquette or courtesy. We were certainly sur-

prised to hear such a sentiment promulgated by a member of the medical profession; but we hope that further reflection on his part, may lead to a modification of such views. And we may venture to hope, that the principles of medical ethics for regulating the relations of professional men, which the professors of the schools are always so careful to inculcate, will, in future, not be absolutely ignored in the public hospital of Jamaica.

We have to request that you will, at your earliest convenience, forward this letter to his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, with a request that he may be pleased, if he think fit, to lay a copy of the same before the board of visitors.

We are, your obedient servants,

ANDREW DUNN, M.D.

ALEX. FIDDES, F.R.C.S., E.,

Ordinary Medical Officers, Public Hospital,

To D. P. TRENCH, Esq., Inspector and Director
of Public Hospital.

APPENDIX, No. 7.

EXTRACT FROM THE EVIDENCE OF DR. BOWERBANK GIVEN BEFORE
A COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, AND PUBLISHED IN
THE VOTES OF THE HOUSE FOR 1863-64. SEE APPENDIX No. 36
OF THIS DOCUMENT.

Members of the committee appointed to enquire into the condition of the hospital, having expressed a desire that the entries, minutes, and other documents belonging to the board of visitors should be published, together with the *ad interim* report and evidence taken before this committee, I entirely agree with them in this desire; the more especially as some members have informed me that a letter, not now amongst these documents, is to be introduced amongst them by Dr. Fiddes; and that the object of introducing this letter is to bring forward the answer of the medical officers to a statement made by me as a member of the board of visitors. I therefore willingly gave my consent, never having, however, seen this letter. And this letter, having now been laid before this committee, I find that certain extracts from it were forwarded by the Lieutenant-Governor to the inspector and director to be laid before the board of visitors. I shall close this my evidence thus:

I have read this document, which purports to be a communication, of the date of the 25th July, 1863, from Drs. Andrew Dunn and Alexander Fiddes, the two ordinary medical officers of the public hospital, to Mr. Trench, the inspector and director; and, having done so, I will only observe, that as neither Drs. Andrew Dunn or Alexander Fiddes are the appointed judges of my professional capabilities and actions, I ignore their opinions, and am quite willing to leave their decision (being interested individuals) to be weighed in the balance of public opinion.

As my statements, the whole, or a great portion of which, before being written, were made orally to the board of visitors when these gentlemen were present, and neither of them then expressed the sentiments they have since written to the inspector and director, I can-

not but feel surprised. In making the oral and written statements I did, I felt I was performing my duty as a visitor of the hospital; and in doing so, I did not consider that I was in any degree answerable to the medical officers. The board of visitors report for the information of his Excellency the Governor, and not for the medical officers; and, so long as I hold any public office, I will take care and do my duty to the public faithfully and fearlessly.

As regards the jeers, the taunts, and the insinuations showered upon me by Drs. Dunn and Fiddes, I assure these gentlemen that I can afford to put up with them, coming, as they do, from them, and to receive them not only calmly and with good temper, but with a feeling akin to gratitude to them; believing, as I do, that every man in this community who conscientiously and honestly does his duty, is sure to be attacked by those who are not inclined to give themselves too much trouble for the public good. So far from feeling myself damaged by the remarks they have thought proper to commit to paper, I am certain that my character, both here and at home, will be raised by this attack upon it.

As they have been plain-spoken with regard to me, I will be candid to them; and will only remark, that from my observation of the conduct of either of them throughout the whole hospital controversy, I have no hesitation in declaring to them, that in want of a mentor, I should not appeal to either of them to guide me in consistency of conduct, in integrity of purpose, or in that high moral bearing becoming a man and a Christian.

Believing, as I verily do, that the object of these two gentlemen has been covertly to injure me in the estimation of his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor of this island, and by resorting to the old dodge of raising up personal questions and disagreements to draw off attention from, and enquiry into the present condition and management of the hospital under their care, I now challenge them if they dare, as an earnest of their sincerity, to join me with all their influence in persuading the legislature of this island to request the British government to send out a competent and disinterested person or commission, to enquire into the condition and management of the public hospital of Kingston, and also into all other institutions of this island, and into the carrying out of the arrangements between the employers of immigrants and medical men.—In this way, and thus alone, will the whole truth be obtained.


The above evidence and remarks have been written off hurriedly, and with frequent interruptions. My style may be bad and desultory; but thank God, it is written with honesty and truth on my part. I write *calamo currente*, with a full belief in all I say; and do not stop to trim, and am quite regardless of the remarks of those who are no admirers of reform, especially where it imposes increased responsibilities.

(SIGNED) LEWIS Q. BOWERBANK, F.R.C.P., Ed.

Spanish Town, December, 1863.

"ECCE SIGNUM."





COLONIAL OFFICE
LIBRARY