

Reg 26-12-25
BIRTHDAYS NEXT WEEK

Prominent South Australians

(By "Felix")

Tomorrow, December 27, Professor R. W. Chapman, M.A., B.C.E., one of the best-known members of the professional staff of the University of Adelaide, will celebrate his fifty-ninth birthday. He was born at Stony Stratford, Bucks, England. Brought to Australia in his tenth year, he attended Wesley College, Melbourne, and Trinity College, Melbourne, where he won several exhibitions in mathematics and took his M.A. and B.C.E. degrees with final first-class honors. After leaving the University he was engaged on engineering works in Victoria. In 1889 he came to Adelaide as lecturer at the University on mathematics and physics. For several years he was also lecturer on applied mechanics at the School of Mines. From 1900 to 1907 he was lecturer at the University on engineering, and then became the first professor of engineering, a position he occupied until 1910, when he was appointed to his present Chair of Mathematics and Mechanics. The Professor is a member of the Council of



PROF. R. W. CHAPMAN

the University and of the Council of the School of Mines and Industries. He has been president of the Astronomical Society of South Australia, of the South Australian Institute of Surveyors, of the South Australian Institute of Surveyors and Engineers, and of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Professor Chapman is a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society and author of an important work, "Astronomy for Surveyors," published in London, and of numerous papers relating to engineering, surveying, and kindred subjects. Mr. R. H. Chapman (Chief Engineer for Railways) is a son.

Sir Archibald Strong, M.A., Litt.D., professor of English language and literature in the University of Adelaide, will be 49 on next Wednesday, December 30. His father, the late Herbert Strong, M.A., was for many years professor of classics in the University of Melbourne, and subsequently professor of Latin at Liverpool University. The son was born in Melbourne. At an early age he proceeded with his parents to England and received his advanced education at Liverpool and Oxford Universities. Later he went to Marburg. He returned to Melbourne in 1902. For many years he was literary critic on the Melbourne "Herald," was a founder of the Melbourne Repertory Theatre, president of the Melbourne Literature Society in 1910, and president of the



PROF. ARCHIBALD STRONG

Shakespeare Society in 1913, in which year he was appointed lecturer in English at the University. From 1916 to 1919 he was acting professor of English language and literature in Melbourne University. In March, 1922, he came to Adelaide to assume the duties of professor in the Jury Chair of English Language and Literature. During the war the Professor contributed largely to the press on current topics of European interest. He is the author of

three volumes of verse—one a translation of "The Ballades of Theodore de Banville," a volume of essays on Shelley, Wordsworth, and Meredith; of "Peradventure" (a volume of critical essays), and other works. The Professor will be returning to Adelaide shortly from England, where he has been taking a year's leave of absence. He was knighted a few months ago.

Adv. 26-12-25

At the December conferring of degrees at the University of Melbourne on Wednesday, Mr. A. C. Garnett, W.E.A., lecturer at the University of Adelaide, received the degree of D.Litt. in absentia.

Reg 30-12-25

Miss Iris E. Robertson, M.A., who will leave to-day for Europe by the Anchises to study modern languages and literature at the Sorbonne, in Paris, has had a distinguished scholastic career. The whole of her course at the University of Adelaide has been taken by the means of winning bursaries. In 1922 Miss Robertson was awarded the John Howard Clark Prize and Scholarship, and in the following year took her B.A. degree. She was also the recipient of the Roby Fletcher Prize for logic and psychology, and at the recent commemoration the degree of M.A. was conferred upon her. Miss Robertson is the daughter of Mr. F. T. Robertson, associate editor of The Advertiser.

Adv. 30-12-25

Miss Iris Robertson, who has just completed a successful course at the Adelaide University, will leave by the Anchises for Europe to-day. During her course she was the recipient of the John Howard Clark prize and scholarship for English language and literature, and the Roby Fletcher prize for logic and psychology. At the last Commemoration the degree of M.A. was conferred upon her. Miss Robertson intends to study for some time at the Sorbonne, Paris, to extend her acquaintance with modern languages and literature.

The Rev. K. J. E. Bickersteth, headmaster of St. Peter's College, will leave by the R.M.S. Ormuz to-morrow, on a tour of Egypt, Palestine, Italy, and Great Britain. He expects to return to South Australia in September next.

Adv. 30-12-25

Dr. J. R. Cornish, of Adelaide, has been appointed house surgeon at the Dreadnought Hospital, Greenwich, England.

Reg 31-12-25



MISS IRIS E. ROBERTSON, M.A., particulars of whom were published in The Register on Wednesday.

Adv. 31-12-25

Mr. G. A. Hancock, M.A., Dip. Ed. (Adelaide), F.R.G.S., has been appointed to the resident teaching staff at Scots College, Warwick, Queensland. Mr. Hancock was recently attached to Scots College, Sydney.

Reg 30-12-25
MEDICAL ETIQUETTE.
R. 30

In this morning's cable messages, there will be found summarized a protest against the conservatism of the British General Medical Council, made by the famous surgeon, Sir Arbuthnot Lane, who declares that America "sets a splendid example." As to that phase of the question which Sir Arbuthnot has specially in mind, this may be true; but, in general, his choice of the United States as a source of inspiration is not altogether happy. Revelations of the kind made a few days ago in the course of a "medical diploma mill" prosecution in America—as the outcome of which "Dr." Helmuth Heller was sentenced to two years' imprisonment for the indiscriminate sale of bogus certificates of competency to the most dangerous quacks—would seem amply to justify the rigidity of the rules governing the conduct of the medical profession in Great Britain. Some centuries of painful experience contributed to the elaboration of the laws of medical etiquette, which have long operated, in every English-speaking country, at all events, to maintain the best traditions of the profession of healing, in the interests of its practitioners primarily, perhaps, but for the good of the public in the highest degree. No set of cast-iron regulations was ever yet enforced without producing an anomaly, and the British ethical code of medical practice, which could not be relaxed without fear of the gravest consequences, is not exceptional in its infliction of hardship and apparent injustice upon the individual. The case of Sir Herbert Barker is a striking illustration of the impossibility of reconciling utter inelasticity with complete reason in the regulation of a great part of human affairs. Sir Herbert Barker is not a registered medical practitioner, and is hopelessly excluded from the British Medical Association. Some years ago, therefore, when a registered member of the profession, Dr. Axham, was proved to have administered an anaesthetic to a patient of "Mr. Barker, the osteopath," the Medical Council found that he (Dr. Axham) had been guilty of "infamous conduct," and struck him off the roll. Since Dr. Axham incurred the severe penalty prescribed for co-operation with an unprofessional practitioner, however, the latter, upon the petition of four distinguished surgeons, has been knighted! Moreover, it is believed that, almost ever since the Axham incident, eminent doctors have habitually, although, of course, secretly, advised certain of their patients to consult "Mr. Barker," in the expectation that he would succeed, where qualified practitioners had failed and even despaired.

Ludicrous as these circumstances appear, it is not proposed to endeavour to render them less so, either by admitting Sir Herbert Barker to registration, or re-admitting the unfortunate Dr. Axham. To do the first, would render it extremely difficult to exclude from the profession many another specially skilled osteopath, and, after these, come osteopaths in general, and cheiro-practors, and others whose names and numbers are legion. The registration of Dr. Axham might invite other members of the profession to break the rules at their discretion, and these most vital laws would at once cease to be as those of the Medes and Persians. For society, the results would be disastrous. In maintaining an excessively strict code among themselves, the doctors are protecting the public by means for which there is no substitute, and everything possible should be done, therefore, to uphold the splendid traditions which are the basis of medicine as a self-disciplinary profession. In Australia, at all events, the immediate need would seem to be, not the relaxation of the time-honoured rules of medical etiquette, but special insistence upon their observance. There are disquieting signs that, among the younger generation of doctors and surgeons, particularly, the irreconcilability

of healing and commerce is sometimes not sufficiently realized. The commercially-minded practitioner is still an abnormality, but his activities are sufficiently remarkable, not only to throw into high relief the magnificent altruism of the profession as a whole, but to justify genuine alarm lest the old standard should ever be relaxed. It is a healthy sign, that some of the leaders of the medical profession should have been the first to denounce the practices of the few "get-rich-quick" young men among their brethren, whose attention is apt to be divided between the patient and his banking account. Unfortunately, in this instance, medical etiquette, as Sir Arbuthnot Lane points out, forbids the discussion of medical matters by medical men in the "lay" press, and professional strictures upon the unprofessional acquisitiveness of certain "rising" practitioners have been confined to the *Medical Journal*. In the columns of that paper, in recent months, however, there has been some exceedingly plain speaking.

The most unpleasantly suggestive of all the complaints has reference to the increase of the practice of "fee-splitting." When a surgeon "splits his fee" with a physician, a principle becomes operative which is both general and allowable throughout the whole fabric of commerce. That fee-splitting should be so detestable a thing in medicine, therefore, serves to emphasize an important distinction. To split a fee is merely to pay a commission. The general practitioner A, called to attend B, let us suppose, genuinely believes it

to be necessary that the patient should undergo an operation. B is eager, of course, that this operation should be performed by the best qualified surgeon available, and A, asked for his advice on so important a particular, conscientiously names C. When it is all over, and C has been paid a handsome fee, he forwards some part of it to A, in acknowledgment of the latter's reliance upon his skill, and to compensate him for the fact that his fees as a general practitioner are disproportionately modest. If the transaction has been scrupulously honest, and a necessary operation has, in fact, been performed, at the usual rate, by a highly-skilled surgeon, the patient cannot be said to have suffered from this unprofessional proceeding. The dangers inherent in the system, however, are obvious. A is not only under a temptation to advise an operation, whether it is essential or not, but his choice of surgeons is in danger of being determined by prudential, rather than by scientific considerations. C possibly splits his fee more generously than some of his brethren, many of whom, of course, will not split their fees at all. An eminent Melbourne surgeon complains:—

Three years ago I had within six weeks six cases sent to me from the country by one practitioner. They were extraordinarily good gynaecological cases, and all paid remunerative fees. Incidentally the postoperative results were excellent. Suddenly the flow of cases stopped. On making careful enquiries I had almost enough evidence to show that the country practitioner ceased to send me cases as he did not receive half my operative fees. A specialist friend of mine stated a price to a general practitioner for an abdominal operation. The general practitioner collected the fee and sent the specialist half his fee, reserving the rest for himself. A young man in practice with medical tendencies quite recently told me that affairs were going better with him as he had arranged with another young friend with surgical aspirations to split fees. These instances of fee splitting are much more suggestive of "infamous conduct" than was the offence for which Dr. Axham still suffers. The fact that the public is virtually powerless in the matter, is the strongest possible proof, however, of the need for the existence of the inflexible ethical code against which he offended, and the only thing to be feared is failure to enforce it in every particular.

Reg 30-12-25

Dr. J. R. Cornish, of Adelaide, has been appointed house surgeon at the Dreadnought Hospital, at Greenwich, England.