

2132. Have you ever expressed the opinion that you considered the Hospital insanitary?—I did not realise how insanitary the Hospital was until I went to the work of drafting that memorandum, that was adopted as a report by the staff.

2133. Have you expressed yourself to that effect, that it is insanitary?—I think that report, which was well-known to be my draft, was a very strong expression.

2134. Prior to that you had not?—Prior to that I had always supported resolutions passed by the staff. I spoke at the meeting with the Trustees before the operating-theatre was built, as to the necessity for an operating-room. The question of sanitation was also raised, but I did not speak on it.

2135. Did you complain of other matters such as draughts?—There was no use making complaints when the Trustees had done their best for me in the matter. I asked for a special ward for eye cases, and they gave me the only one they could give me—the front tower ward. It is very unsuitable for the purpose, but it was better than nothing. There is a terrible draught there, and the ward is anything but a desirable one. It is better to operate, there, however, than to run the risk of operating in a general surgical ward. I have endeavoured to be reasonable in the matter, and have not asked the Trustees for things I knew they could not give me.

2136. And you have not spoken to the Board, have you?—I have spoken to individual members, and I spoke to Mr. Houghton when he was chairman.

2137. Now, as to the cases you mention. Have you had septic cases in your outside practice?—Until those two eyeredectomies in the Hospital in 1884 I had never seen an eye lost by eyeredectomy, and I have never seen it since then.

2138. But have you seen appearances?—I have never seen them, that I recollect, with the exception of those two cases, but I am certain that in my private practice I never had a trace of it.

2139. Would it not have been a matter of some importance to have sent in a written report to the Trustees making statements such as you make here?—Well, as a matter of fact, possibly I did not act energetically enough in the matter. I made no row about it, as Dr. Roberts can tell you. He was house surgeon, and we endeavoured to trace septic trouble to its source. Certainly the thing was not glossed over.

2140. You did not report to the Trustees?—Not as a body.

2141. Did you report it in the memorandum to the medical staff?—It has been before the medical staff, but I have never written a memorandum about it.

2142. Was it ever brought formally before them?—It was brought prominently before them of one individual whose case was supposed to have affected me. In conversation it has been brought before the whole as a body.

2143. When?—The matter was brought up at the dispute as to the condition of the Hospital last year.

2144. But that would be after a lapse of four years in the one case and five in the other?—I might put it in this way: The members of the staff—most of them, if not all—were cognisant that I had these cases.

2145. But it was never brought before the medical staff in a formal manner, so that it might be communicated to the Trustees?—There were reasons why it should not.

2146. You may give them, if you like?—In one case, where a man lost his eye from septic trouble, after eyeredectomy, he was anxious to take proceedings.

2147. *The Chairman.*] Against whom?—He spoke about a number against whom he might proceed. He was a man who lost his eye because he had been next a septic case in ward No. 1, but I thought it would be better for the Hospital and all concerned to leave it alone.

2148. Was there any minute made in the minute-book of the staff at the time?—I do not think there was. I have not seen the minute-book of the staff.

2149. *Mr. Chapman.*] My question was wider. Was it before the staff as a body?—It has not been.

2150. You have said you have been inclined to put off operations because of the condition of affairs. Have you ever actually abstained from operating because of the condition of the Hospital?—I have done more than that. I have operated outside rather than inside. I had a patient who came to me from Wellington about three weeks ago, and there was at that time a case of erysipelas in the childrens' ward—in which she was placed—or, at all events, there had been erysipelas or septic trouble there a day or two before. The child had only one useful eye, a very bad one, or at any rate, there was only one eye that might be saved, and I had to resort to eyeredectomy to save the eye. I did that outside, and on the second day the child came to my study without any help. In ten days the child went back to Wellington. I do not think I could have got those results in the Hospital. I believe that if the child had been taken in she would not have been convalescent now.

2151. Then, in this month, is that the only one you refer to of that character? Is that the only one?—I have frequently to do small operations. I am going to do one on Tuesday next which I refused to take into the Hospital.

2152. But earlier than this: say, prior to this year? Have you actually abstained from operating in any case by reason of the septic condition of the Hospital?—I think that the uneasy feeling I had about the Hospital has for many months influenced me in deciding whether I should operate or not.

2153. That is not an answer to my question?—It is a distinct answer, that in doubtful cases I do not operate.

2154. Leave aside recent troubles and go back prior to this year. Have you actually abstained from operating on any of your Hospital patients by reason of a fear arising out of the insanitary conditions?—When you put it in that way, it comes to be a question whether I can recall cases.

2155. I do not expect you to draw on your imagination, but on your memory?—Well, I say