

The Advertiser
20th Aug 1898

"Advertiser"
20th Aug. 1898.

"Advertiser"
20th Aug. 1898.

ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

BOARD MEETING.

THE OLD TROUBLE.

The board of management of the Adelaide Hospital held its fortnightly meeting on Friday afternoon, August 19, when there were present the Chairman (Mr. C. Tucker, Mayor of Adelaide), the Hon. W. A. Robinson, M.L.C., Messrs. C. R. Morris (Mayor of Port Adelaide), C. Lyons, W. G. Coombs, A. Mackie, A. A. Kirkpatrick, Dr. Hill, Messdames Parkin, Cullen, and Edwards. Dr. Napier was present also.

THE HOSPITAL AND THE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. Mackie asked—Has the chairman the information that on the 28th inst. a motion will be submitted to the South Australian branch of the British Medical Association by Dr. Poulton to the following effect:—"That the council be respectfully requested to take such steps as may be necessary for securing the removal of the members who continue in association with men who have been expelled from the British Medical Association?"

The Chairman replied—Yes, I have received a circular to that effect.

Mr. Mackie—If yes, will the chairman inform this board whether in the event of the said motion being carried it will affect members of the hospital staff, and also members of this board of management, or in other words will the carrying of such proposed motion by Dr. Poulton affect such gentlemen as Drs. Hamilton, Bickle, Hill, Shepherd, and Niesche?

The Chairman—Yes. I understand all those gentlemen are members of the association; also in addition Drs. Curtis, Whittell, Phillips, and Cludening, who are honorary consulting members of the hospital staff and members of the association.

Mr. Mackie—At the recently held conference between a sub-committee of the Adelaide University and a sub-committee of the Adelaide Hospital, at which the first-named sub-committee said that they had no objection to the reappointments of Drs. Napier and Smith, did the University sub-committee affirm that Drs. Poulton, Giles, Hayward, and Verco were prepared to resume their professional relations with the hospital on certain conditions? If so, what were the conditions?—or, in other words, is it true that the four doctors named were prepared, or any of them, to work in association with Drs. Napier and Smith?

The Chairman—I ask you not to press that question. I prefer not to answer that question unless you press it.

Mr. Mackie—I feel it is my duty to press that question. I feel that under existing circumstances the more fully the sub-committee which was appointed in this matter takes the board into its confidence the better it will be. I was not a member of the sub-committee, but I feel as a member of the board that I have a right to know what took place at the meetings of the sub-committee. I therefore respectfully but firmly, in view of the action which Dr. Poulton intends to take, press for an answer to that question.

Mr. Lyons—Was there sufficient evidence to enable us to arrive at a conclusion on that point? I was a member of that sub-committee and there was nothing took place that would enable the chairman or anyone else to give an answer to that question.

Mr. Mackie—I think the question should be answered if it is in the chairman's power.

The Chairman—I can only say that it is undoubtedly true, as the whole of the late hon. staff were suggested for reinstatement in the conditions, but I will not mention the whole of the conditions without the consent of the hospital sub-committee and the sub-committee of the University. It is absolutely true that no objections were raised by the University sub-committee to these gentlemen working with Drs. Napier and Smith in the hospital. Dr. Lendon was a member of the University sub-committee.

Mr. Mackie—Was the expulsion of Drs. Napier and Smith from the British Medical Association due to the action of the South Australian branch of that association, as suggested by Dr. Anstey Giles in his recently-published address; and was the sole reason for such action that the gentlemen named had taken office at the Adelaide Hospital?

The Chairman—No sensible man could understand otherwise. There is no other reason that could be alleged against the professional honor of those gentlemen.

Mr. Mackie—Have the negotiations been broken off between the Adelaide University and the Adelaide Hospital respecting the re-establishment of the Medical School?

The Chairman—No, but I think the proposed action of Dr. Poulton is likely to seriously imperil the chances of an amicable settlement between the hospital and the University in regard to the Medical School.

Dr. Hill—It makes a settlement impossible.

INCREASE OF ADMISSIONS.

The secretary (Mr. Haggard) reported the following facts with regard to the admissions to the hospital during the first portion of the past three years:—January 1 to August 18, 1896, 1,528; January 1 to August 18, 1897, 1,743; January 1 to August 18, 1898, 2,674; showing an increase of admissions in 1898 of 946 over those of 1896, and of 331 over those of 1897.

MEDICAL REPORT.

The senior resident medical officer's report for the two weeks ending August 18 was as follows:—Patients admitted, 167; discharged, 108; died, 10; now in hospital, 188; out-patients treated, 655, of whom 146 were new. Causes of death—Nephritis, apoplexy, malformation of heart, fractured skull (2), phthisis, myelitis, &c., senile decay, acute tuberculosis, carcinoma of jaw.

There are at present in the institution six cases of typhoid fever, eight of measles, three of scarlatina, and two of erysipelas.

THE NORMANS IN EUROPE.

That historical lectures can be appreciated and draw a good audience was again proved on Friday evening, when Mr. E. G. Blackmore gave the third of his series of lectures on "The Normans" at the University. The lecturer dealt with the story of the last 11 years of the Conqueror's reign, and the life and reign of his successor, William Rufus. The 11 years, 1076-1087, are a poor sequel to those which preceded them. The deterioration of the great king's character, the petty campaigns he undertook with such inglorious results, the quarrels with his eldest son, and his death under ignoble circumstances, were set forth with clearness and force. Probably none but those who have read the contemporary annals and chronicles have any idea of the utter moral depravity of the Red King, the unworthy son and successor of the Conqueror. By a free use of these the lecturer was able to give a vivid portraiture of one whose eternal damnation, the lecturer said, was assumed by all men as a matter of course—who was buried like a dog, without any funeral service whatever, the feeling being that neither mass, nor prayer, nor offerings could avail for a soul so hopelessly lost. The subject of the next lecture, the last but one, will be "The life, reign, and character of Henry I."

"Advertiser"
20th Aug 1898.

THE HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL STUDENTS.

To the Editor.

Sir—In your issue of to-day there appears a report of the Adelaide University dinner, and Dr. A. A. Lendon is reported as saying that he "expressed his regret that students had to go elsewhere to gain the honors which they should have gained in this colony." I cannot understand these remarks coming from such a source, as Dr. Lendon must know, and it is time all your readers should know, the exact facts of the case, so that for the future these misrepresentations shall cease. In the first place it might very well be said that the present arrangement of University and hospital work is quite in accordance with all existing regulations and requirements if the University authorities wish to avail themselves of the facilities that now exist. The board of management of the hospital and the Government have provided at some cost a staff for instruction of students in a hospital recognised as qualifying for all the examining bodies. The Adelaide Hospital is one among many hospitals recognised by the General Medical Council and by various universities and other examining bodies for the purposes of examination and registration. —I am, &c.,

ONE WHO KNOWS.

August 19, 1898.

"Register" 24th Aug 1898

THE HOSPITAL TROUBLE.

To the Editor.

Sir—I have just read Mr. A. Mackie's letter. I absolutely and without reservation deny that I have been anxious to resume the position occupied at the Hospital prior to the disruption and to work there in conjunction with Drs. Napier and Smith. I would not take office under the present Board or with the present staff.

I am, Sir, &c., BEN. POULTON.

33, North-terrace, August 23.

To the Editor.

Sir—On account of a letter appearing in "The Register" to-day I must ask you to allow me a small amount of space to absolutely deny the statement contained therein—that I am or at any time have been anxious to go back to the Adelaide Hospital. I wish emphatically to say that I have never given my consent to return to work in that institution; and, strange as it may appear to some, I have no desire to associate with the present staff. I quite agree with what Dr. Hayward has written.

I am, Sir, &c., W. ANSTEY GILES.

August 23.

"Register" 24th Aug 1898

"WANTED—A PUBLIC HOSPITAL."

To the Editor.

Sir—To the above heading to Dr. Poulton's letter I might add "Wanted remunerative appointments." I am prepared, like Dr. Poulton, "under conditions to subscribe £100 per annum for five years to the proposed new hospital." One of the conditions would be that, like Dr. Poulton has done, I should draw the salary of £220 per annum from the University chest and students for teaching, and thus make a net profit, as Dr. Poulton would again do, of £120 per annum. The sincerity of Dr. Poulton's statement—"So strongly do I feel the need of such an institution"—will no doubt be evident to others besides some of his professional brethren, especially as Dr. Hayward has already publicly announced that doctors do not hold hospital appointments solely from humanitarian principles.

ALFRED W. HILL.

I am, Sir, &c., [Dr. Poulton was not responsible for the heading to his letter.—Ed.]

ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BOARD.

Friday, August 19.

Present—The Chairman, Mr. C. Tucker, Hon. W. A. Robinson, M.L.C., Messrs. C. R. Morris, Mayor of Port Adelaide, C. Lyons, A. Mackie, W. G. Coombs, and A. A. Kirkpatrick, Drs. Hill and Leth Napier, and Messdames Parkin, Cullen, and Edwards.

Mr. Mackie asked if the Chairman had information that on August 23 a motion would be submitted to the South Australian Branch of the British Medical Association by Dr. Poulton to the following effect:—"That the Council be respectfully requested to take such steps as may be necessary for securing the removal of those members who continue in association with men who have been expelled from the British Medical Association." The Chairman replied that he had received a circular to that effect.—Mr. Mackie asked if the Chairman would inform the Board whether in the event of the said motion being carried it would effect members of the Hospital staff, and also members of the Board, or would the carrying of such motion by Dr. Poulton affect such gentlemen as Drs. Hamilton, Bickle, Hill, Shepherd, and Niesche.—The Chairman said yes he understood all those gentlemen were members of the Association; also Drs. Curtis, Whittell, Phillips, and Cludening, who are hon. consulting members of the Hospital staff, and also of the Association.—Mr. Mackie said that at the recently held conference between a sub-committee of the Adelaide University and a sub-committee of the Adelaide Hospital the first-named sub-committee said they had no objection to the reappointment of Drs. Napier and Smith. He asked did the University sub-committee affirm that Drs. Poulton, Giles, Hayward, and Verco were prepared to resume their professional relations with the Hospital on certain conditions. If so, what were the conditions, or was it true that the four doctors named were prepared, or any of them, to work in association with Drs. Napier and Smith?—The Chairman asked Mr. Mackie not to press the question. He would prefer not to answer it unless he pressed it.—Mr. Mackie felt it his duty to press it. In existing circumstances the more fully the sub-committee which was appointed took the Board into their confidence the better it would be. He was not a member of the sub-committee, but he was a member of the Board, and he felt he had a right to know what transpired at the meeting of the sub-committee. He therefore respectfully and firmly, in view of the action of Dr. Poulton, pressed for an answer.—Mr. Lyons asked if there was sufficient evidence to enable them to arrive at a conclusion on that point. He was a member of that sub-committee, and the report was before the meeting, and there was nothing which took place which would enable the Chairman or any one else to give an answer to the question.—Mr. Mackie thought the question should be answered if it were in the Chairman's power.—The Chairman said the reply was that it was undoubtedly true, as the whole of the late Honorary Staff were suggested in the negotiations for reinstatement, but he would not mention the other conditions without the consent of the Hospital sub-committee and the sub-committee of the University. It was absolutely true that no objections were raised by the University sub-committee to these doctors working in the Hospital with Drs. Napier and Smith, and Dr. Lendon was a member of the University sub-committee.—Mr. Mackie asked was the expulsion of Drs. Napier and Smith from the British Medical Association due to the action of the South Australian Branch of that Association, as suggested by Dr. Anstey Giles in his recently published address, and was the sole reason for such action that the gentlemen named had taken office at the Adelaide Hospital?—The Chairman replied that no sensible man could understand otherwise. There was no other reason which could be alleged against the professional honour of those gentlemen.—Mr. Mackie asked if the negotiations had been broken off between the Adelaide University and the Adelaide Hospital respecting the re-establishment of the Medical School.—The Chairman answered no, but he thought the proposed action of Dr. Poulton was likely to seriously imperil the chances of an amicable settlement between the Hospital and the University in regard to the Medical School. (Dr. Hill—"It makes a settlement impossible.")

A report was presented by the Secretary showing the number of admissions to the Hospital during the first portion of the past three years to have been—January 1 to August 18, 1896, 1,528; January 1 to August 18, 1897, 1,743; January 1 to August 18, 1898, 2,674; being an increase in 1898 of 946 over those of 1896 and 331 over those of 1897.

The Senior Resident Medical Officer's report for the two weeks ended August 18 was as follows:—Patients admitted, 167; discharged, 108; died, 10; now in Hospital, 188; out-patients treated, 658, of whom 146 were new. Causes of deaths—Nephritis, apoplexy, malformation of heart, fractured skull (2), phthisis, myelitis, &c., senile decay, acute tuberculosis, carcinoma of jaw. At present in the institution—Six cases of typhoid, eight cases of measles, three cases of scarlatina, and two of erysipelas.