

*The Advertiser*  
25th Aug. 1898.

To the Editor.

Sir—As a majority of the members of the Hospital Board think it is for the best interests of the institution that the important part of their meetings should be held in secret—or, as they call it, "in committee"—it is impossible for the ordinary public to know what takes place at these meetings, and consequently they cannot decide any question on the facts. Mr. Mackie, a member of the Board, in answer to a letter from Dr. Hayward, states:—"It is substantially true that Drs. Giles, Poulton, Verco, and Hayward have been anxious to resume the positions they occupied at the Hospital prior to the disruption, and to work there in conjunction with Drs. Napier and Smith." Mr. Mackie is evidently referring to certain negotiations that have from time to time taken place between the Hospital Board and the University for the purpose of reinstating the Medical School. It is a pity he did not look up the minutes of the different meetings held, and the schemes suggested for this end by each party. If he had done so he would have known that what he said, instead of being substantially true, is substantially "untrue"; and it would have been better for his love of the truth if he had read the minutes instead of relying on the statements of the Chairman of the Board, and other authorities, who, I should say, are too vague to be mentioned. I think it would settle the question whether the doctors named by Mr. Mackie are anxious to get back into the Hospital and work there with Drs. Napier and Smith if the Board or the University Council published the correspondence, minutes of meetings, schemes, &c., submitted. The public would then know the truth. I am sorry that, having to attend a funeral on Friday last, I did not arrive at the meeting of the Board until it had retired into its seclusion, and I knew nothing of Mr. Mackie's remarks until I saw them in "The Register" on Saturday morning.

I am, Sir, &c.,  
THOMAS F. WIGLEY.

*Hospital*

*The Register*  
29th Aug. 1898.

CONSERVATORIUM GRAND ORCHESTRA.

The Conservatorium Grand Orchestra may now credit themselves with being the first body of instrumentalists to present in Adelaide a programme entirely drawn from the writings of the master of the "music of the future." On previous occasions when "Wagner nights" were given by Heinicke's Grand Orchestra the title applied to only one-half the programme, the remainder being made up with selections by various composers. The concert at the Town Hall on Saturday evening was, with the exception of one vocal number, Gounod's "There is a green hill," entirely Wagnerian, and additional interest was lent to the occasion by the production of two "new" numbers, "Der ritt der Walkuren" and the "Introduction and bridal chorus" from "Lohengrin." The former is a novel and striking piece of tone-painting. Short, detached passages of the nature of "slides" in the highest register of the violins and flutes, with numerous trills, form a weird accompaniment for an imposing melody, which is pompously announced by the brass. Several rapid descending chromatic scale passages and perfectly Wagnerian climaxes add to the effect of the piece, which comes to a queer and abrupt conclusion, with several unaccompanied drumbeats and a final fortissimo chord. Its performance by the orchestra gave evidence of careful preparation, and due justice was done to its many novel characteristics. The "Bridal chorus" from "Lohengrin," though not previously played by the orchestra, is familiar to all musical folk as a pianoforte or organ solo. It is, however, heard to much better advantage when played by an orchestra, for in it, as in all Wagner's works, contrasts of tone colour and striking tone effects are most important features. A euphonium solo in the introduction was capitally played, and later, when that instrument was strengthened by the trombones, the effect was noble and imposing. A word of praise is due to the wood-wind, especially the clarinet, oboe, and bassoon, for their efforts in the "Bridal march." Of the remaining instrumental numbers the most important was the ballet music from "Rienzi," first given by orchestra in September, 1897. This fine selection, which at once exhibits the great master in all his gorgeousness of colour and rich harmonies, is divided into several sections, which portray "the arrival of the warriors," "the lancers' display," "the gladiators' camp," "arrival of the maidens," and "festive dance." The whole piece was presented in a powerful and realistic manner, and was heartily applauded, while the succeeding item, Wagner's pretty and unpretentious "Album leaf No. 1," was invested with capital expression and fine precision. One of the best performances of the evening was the "Prize song" from the "Meistersinger," which was played with admirable finish. The Norwegian sailors' chorus from the "Flying Dutchman" was also a creditable piece of work, and the remaining numbers, the "Pilgrims' chorus" and "March" from "Tannhauser," were in all respects highly satisfactory. Mr. R. Nitschke sang "Der Abendstern" (Wagner), accompanied by the orchestra, with such success as to win an enthusiastic recall, that was responded to by a partial repetition of the song. Mr. Nitschke was accorded a similar honour for his rendering of Gounod's "There is a green hill," also given with orchestral accompaniment. Mr. H. Heinicke conducted with his customary tact and discretion, and Mr. A. C. Quin proved an able and reliable leader.

*Advertiser*  
29th Aug. 1898.

THE HOSPITAL TROUBLE.

To the Editor.

Sir—Pressure of engagements has prevented me from replying to Dr. Hayward's letter on this. Legally falsehood falls under two headings—suppression of the truth and false suggestion. I shall not attempt to estimate under which category the letter of Dr. Hayward is most noteworthy. I feel, however, that if Dr. Hayward thinks he has written truthfully, and is merely suffering from loss of memory, it is important that the public should be correctly informed:—1. The letter of Dr. Carter, mentioned by Dr. Hayward, was probably written from an independent standpoint, and manifestly in no way affected the question of the illegal expulsion of Drs. Napier and Smith. 2. A cablegram instigated by prominent members of the South Australian Branch of the British Medical Association, as published in the "British Medical Journal," was sent to Guy's Hospital for the purpose of preventing any member of the medical profession in England from taking office in the Adelaide Hospital. This cablegram so little represented the true state of affairs that the Agent-General had merely to contradict it, and consequently the most eminent medical official in England advised Dr. Napier to accept the office offered him. 3. The South Australian Branch of the British Medical Association passed a boycott motion the night before Drs. Napier and Smith landed in Australia, thus prejudging the action of those doctors without affording them an opportunity of disclaiming any intention to act otherwise than honourably towards their professional brethren—a very different reception from that accorded to Drs. Morrison and Morris, who took office in the Adelaide Hospital at a later period on similar conditions, and who were members of the British Medical Association and still remain so. 4. Dr. Napier has formally mentioned in a letter to the Press that a conspiracy was formed and financed by members of the medical profession belonging to the branch and others. 5. As Dr. Napier communicated by letter addressed to the Council of the British Medical Association, Dr. London, the ex-President of the South Australian Branch, expressed his desire to serve on the Hospital staff with Drs. Napier and Smith on certain conditions. 6. Dr. Hayward admits that the Council of the South Australian Branch instructed Dr. Perks to take action on their behalf against Drs. Napier and Smith. Loitering with intent to steal is, with theft itself, equally regarded as a crime. If the branch and its authorized representative determined on trying to steal Dr. Napier's and Dr. Smith's honourable reputations, they—especially some of the branch members as "old offenders"—must stand convicted of what Dr. Hayward so lamely denies. 7. A communication was made to certain members of the Council of the British Medical Association that, in the event of the parent Association not expelling Drs. Napier and Smith, some of the "influential" members of the South Australian Branch feared that the effect would be to cause the branch to sever its connection with the parent Association. "This was unofficial," but the fact has been published in the English medical Press and circular. If Dr. Hayward does not know this, or has forgotten it, it does not alter the fact. 8. When the Council of the British Medical Association asked Drs. Napier and Smith to express their opinion on the proposed expulsion, and these gentlemen sent replies, those replies were never submitted to the annual meeting. All that the annual meeting of the British Medical Association was asked to do was to confirm the recommendation of the Council—"That the names of Drs. Napier and Smith should be removed." No charge was brought against them. I emphatically contradict Dr. Hayward's statement, and challenge him to prove it; that counsel appeared on behalf of Drs. Napier and Smith at the annual meeting of the British Medical Association, to state objections to the proposal, as Dr. Hayward asserts in his letter. 9. The action was illegal, and had Drs. Napier and Smith been at liberty to return to England they could have so exposed the unfair conduct of the profession in Adelaide that the Council of the parent Association would have been obliged either to resign office or restore Drs. Napier and Smith's names. But Dr. Napier and Dr. Smith then felt that the action—not only of certain individual members of the branch, but of the branch itself—was so contemptible and the behaviour of the Council at home so biased and unbusinesslike, that they esteemed it a privilege to be free from any association with the one or the other, and they are still of the same mind. It is impossible for those unacquainted with the deceit and misrepresentation that has been practised by members of the branch in their individual capacity to realize that such things are believable of men claiming the respect of their fellow-citizens. 10. I feel in harmony with Dr. Hayward on one point—namely, that full light should be thrown on all matters affecting this question. For my part, when the Council of the University consents to my so doing, I will gladly agree that every line shall be published and every action made known. Then the public will know how questionable has been the conduct of the doctors on the other side. 11. If Dr. Hayward thought that his own contribution to the "Review of Reviews" published at the same time as Mr. Holder's—was of any value, why did he not induce either the branch or the medico-conspiracy-Syndicate to pay for reprinting and distributing the pamphlet? 12. I repeat that two of the late Honorary Staff did attend the meetings of the joint committee of the University Council and Adelaide Hospital, and that neither of those gentlemen intimated directly or indirectly that their returning to the Adelaide Hospital to work under the present management was subject to the approval of the Medical Association of the colony. This statement I can prove by the official minutes of the meeting. In conclusion I apologise for having taken up so much of your valuable space, but this was necessary owing to Dr. Hayward having opened up so much new ground.

I am, Sir, &c.,  
CHS. TUCKER.

Town Hall, August 27.

*The Advertiser*  
25th Aug. 1898.

To the Editor.

Sir—The lively correspondence between the members of the late Honorary Medical Staff of the Hospital and their opponents is interesting, but it might be more so were the sentences of the latter gentlemen somewhat less involved in their construction. It is trying to the patience of a reader who would fain get to the root of the matter to find himself involved in a perfect labyrinth of conjunctions. Sometimes, as in Mr. Charles Tucker's letter, the writer loses his way and never arrives at the goal for which he set out. As the writer probably knows himself what he is driving at, he may think this of little consequence, but the reader who has not the same advantage is often left in a state of painful and hopeless bewilderment.

I am, Sir, &c.,  
FULL STOP.

*Hospital*

*The Register*  
29th Aug. 1898.

To the Editor.

Sir—By your kind permission my name has many times in the past appeared in "The Register," but lately I have omitted it. However, to oblige Mr. Mackie I will, in this instance, add it, so that he may know who wrote the letter signed "G. M." But just let me say I note that gentleman says in his letter—"Inasmuch as the questions put by me which are now the subject of discussion were so put by me in open meeting, and in the presence of the Press representatives." Of course they were; and why was it so, Mr. Mackie? You and your prompter knew if you put them in your secret meeting you could not heap obliquy on the doctors whose names you have mentioned. And now, Mr. Mackie, I ask you—Do you not, in your calm moments, regret that you pressed the Chairman to make statements which were proved by Dr. Hayward to be untrue? I note Mr. Mackie says—"Those who know me do not take me either for a knave or a fool," thus implying that he knows the opinion of all his acquaintances. Well, however many may have thought so of him before his promotion (?) to a seat on the august Hospital Board, I wonder what the gentlemen comprising the Commercial Travellers' Association think of him now. I have long known Mr. Mackie, and still have a lingering respect for him, and have also a small hope that he will yet join those gentlemen in the committee who desire that all their meetings should be open to the Press. Then we who have to find the money

to support the Hospital may know somewhat as to how our money is expended.

I am, Sir, &c.,  
MATTHEW GOODE.

*Hospital*