



Billed then at

Nov - 68 No 22

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

DR. GILLHAM AND OTHER

MEDICAL MEN

IN

MADEIRA.



FUNCHAL — AT A. L. DA CUNHA'S P. OFFICE
N.º 1 — RUA DO PINHEIRO.

COLLEGE OF THE SACS

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

February 3.d 1847.

Sir,

Dr. Ross having brought the following statements under the notice of the whole of the British Medical Practitioners authorized to practise in this Island, we held a meeting in consequence and decided that in our opinion your conduct in the following case, as well as other instances was unprofessional and calculated to lower the respectability of the profession in public estimation.

1st. You were requested by Mr. Donaldson to call as a *friend* and see Mrs. Donaldson, he stating at the same time that Dr. Ross was her medical attendant; during this visit, you made a *professional* examination of her case.

2d. You promised on the same occasion, contrary to all rules of professional propriety, that if Mrs D. was not "enceinte," you could cure her in a fortnight.

3.d During the attendance of another medical man and not being yourself employed in the case, you volunteered information to Mr. D. of a remedy for his wife; not previously or afterwards, intimating your having done so to Mrs. D.'s regular medical attendant.

4.th When Dr. Ross after his return from England mentioned to Mrs. Donaldson his wish to meet and consult with you upon her case, she told him you had informed her husband that unless Dr. Ross would consent to, and approve of, the plan of treatment you wished to pursue, it was of no use your meeting on the subject.

(2)

Under these circumstances, in order to uphold the respectability of an honourable profession, we feel it our duty to decline all professional intercourse with you until a satisfactory refutation of these statements is placed before us. We shall hold a meeting in Dr. Lund's house, Santa Clara, on Tuesday next, February 9.th, and any statement forwarded by you to Dr. Lund's residence, previous to that day, will be duly considered by the meeting.

J. W. BROUGHTON, M. D.
D. M'KELLAR, M. D.
GEORGE LUND, M. D.
JOHN MILLER, M. D.

Dr. Gillham.

Funchal, Feb. 8.th 1847.

Sir,

I am in receipt of a letter signed by yourself, Drs M'Kellar, Lund, and Miller, dated the 3.d Inst., in which you accuse me of having acted unprofessionally towards Dr. Ross in the case of Mrs. Donaldson. *First* — That of being requested by Mr. Donaldson to visit Mrs. D. as a "friend," he stating at the same time that Dr. Ross was her medical attendant.

In reply, I beg to state that I visited Mrs. Donaldson at the earnest request of her husband, and as considered *professionally*. I declare that the word "friend" was never used by Mr. Donaldson; in fact Mr. D.'s family were almost strangers to me; so much

so, that on the day of his requesting me to visit Mrs. Donaldson, he desired Mr. Edward Lewis to introduce him to me. I visited Mrs. D. twice at Santo Antonio and advised her to go further into the country; in fact, I considered her bona fide my patient, until one day I heard accidentally that Dr. Ross had been visiting Mrs. Donaldson at St. George, where I had sent her for change of air, and during her residence there Mr. D. called on me for a prescription for medicines to take out to her. After this time I did not see her until last summer, when I was again requested to visit her at Caniço.

Secondly — That I had said that if Mrs. Donaldson was not enceinte, I could cure her in a fortnight.

I positively deny ever having made such an assertion, but I well recollect having said, when there, that I thought some preparation of iron would tend to restore her after her confinement, believing her disease then to be of a spasmodic nature.

Thirdly — That during the attendance of another Medical man, I volunteered information to Mr. D. of a remedy for his wife.

Some months after I had ceased to attend Mrs. Donaldson, I accidentally met Mr Donaldson in the Street, and named to him, that I had seen that morning in a medical periodical a description of a new preparation of Zinc, which I thought might be suitable to Mrs. Donaldson's case, but at that time I was not at all aware that she was under any medical treatment whatever, Dr. Ross having left the Island.

Fourthly — Refusing to meet Dr. Ross in consultation on Mrs. Donaldson's case, unless he would

consent to the mode of treatment I wished to pursue.

Mr. Donaldson never proposed my meeting Dr. Ross in consultation in any way or manner whatever. A few days after Dr. Ross' arrival from England, Mr. D. called at my house to ask some questions relative to a Seton; when I told him, he was at perfect liberty to call Dr. Ross in again; and his answer was, that he would have a chat with Dr. Ross on the subject; and he left my house with the intention of calling on Dr. Ross, and from that time until the receipt of your letter, I never heard any thing more on the subject.

"I shall always uphold the respectability of our honourable profession," and have always done so, and I cannot but regret that you should have thought it necessary now to bring forward accusations on an affair that took place nearly two years ago.

I am,

Sir

Yours faithfully,

THOMAS GILLHAM,

Dr. Broughton.

February 10.th 1847.

Sir,

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated February 8.th, which we have perused with the

deepest attention: but we regret to state, that we consider its contents to be unsatisfactory.

N.° 1 — Mr. D. and Mrs. D. affirm as positively as you deny that you were invited to visit Mrs. D. merely as a *Friend*, and that, contrary to your statement of being such a stranger as to require an introduction, you had frequently met and conversed with Mr. D. on the case of his wife. You do not deny, and we are satisfied you must have been well aware at the time you visited Mrs. Donaldson, that Doctor Ross was as stated to you by Mr. D., his wife's medical attendant, as he has been ever since her first arrival on the Island; and yet without Dr. Ross being present, or communicating with him either before or afterwards, you made a professional examination of the case which even, though you had been asked to visit professionally (which is denied) was *unprofessional*. Mrs. D. was sent to Porto da Cruz by Dr. Ross, and not as you state, to St. Jorge by yourself. You would lead us to infer, from mentioning your having prescribed for Mrs. D. while at Porto da Cruz, that you were her medical attendant; whereas in fact the occasion of Mrs. D.'s obtaining a prescription from you arose from Mrs. D. becoming suddenly ill; when a message was sent to Dr. Ross, but he being from home, you were asked to prescribe for the attack. Dr. Ross visited Mrs. D. in the afternoon of the same day, and your remedy was never used.

N.° 2 — Here assertion and denial are again opposed: but we would observe that it could hardly have occurred to a non-professional person to have made the reservation (if she was not enceinte) and,

as to the promise of cure in a specified time, Mrs. D. is positive.

3.^o You admit having suggested to Mr. D., when you casually met him in the street, the use of a particular remedy for his wife; but state that you were not aware that she was under any medical treatment whatever at the time: now even supposing this to be the case, thus to volunteer your advice in a case certainly not under your charge at the time, and to which you had not been even previously *professionally* called, we hold to be conduct decidedly *unprofessional*.

N.^o 4.—In reply to the charge of saying to Mr. Donaldson, on being informed of Dr. Ross' wish for a consultation with you on Mrs. D.'s case that unless Dr. Ross would consent to, and approve of, the plan of treatment you wished to pursue, it was of no use your meeting on the subject! You state, that Mr. D. never proposed your meeting Dr. Ross in consultation in any way or manner whatever. To this we can only reply, that Mr. D. writes and Mrs. D. subscribes the charge, and that if we believe *their* declaration, we do not see that we can believe *yours*: as the extraordinary statement which is laid to your charge, assuredly could not have been made unless a consultation had been spoken of.

Upon the whole — weighing the question which has been submitted to us with the greatest impartiality, and viewing it as we have done from first to last, not as a question between Dr. Ross and yourself, but as a strictly professional one, — seeing that we have Dr. Ross' written charges against you of unprofessional

conduct, supported by the written deliberate testimony of two respectable, and so far as we know, unbiassed individuals, and these only met by your own simple denial, — we feel compelled to state, that we see no reason to depart from the resolution intimated to you in our letter of the 3.d current — and this independently of unprofessional conduct in other instances — and we have no doubt of being borne out in this resolution by every unprejudiced individual made fairly aware of the facts of the case.

We think it right however in a matter so seriously affecting the character and status of a member of the Profession, to have the opinion of some of the leading members of that profession in England; and it is our purpose forthwith to submit to them copies of the documents in our possession, including of course your letter of the 3.th current.

In reply to what you state about the case mainly in question, being an affair that took place nearly two years ago, we have only in conclusion to remark that, though commencing about two years ago, the course of conduct complained of in *this* case (we regret that we cannot say in *all* cases) terminated so recently as the month of October last. We remain,

Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

J. W. BROUGHTON, M. D.

Dug M'Kellar, M. D.

GEORGE LUND, M. D.

JOHN MILLER, M. D.

Funchal, Feb. 12.th 1847.

Sir,

I am favoured with your's of the 10.th Inst, regarding the four charges brought against me in your letter of the 3.d Inst. In reply I beg to confirm what I stated in my answers to the accusations.

You will exercise your own discretion as to forwarding any statements you think proper to England, but, as Gentlemen, I trust you will favour me with a copy of what you send. As regards the "respectability of the profession," "and its seriously affecting my character," I shall leave the public to judge. I beg to hand you the following statements and must decline any further correspondence with you on the affair.

I am,

Sir,

Yours faithfully,

THOM. GILLHAM.

Dr. Broughton.

The following cases are submitted not in order to justify myself nor with any invidious feeling towards the medical men mentioned, but merely to show that some of the older Physicians here have acted as "un-

professionally" as I am accused of having done, in their having prescribed for patients of mine during my regular attendance on them without my being made acquainted with such proceedings.

CASE 1st. — Shortly after Dr. Renton left the Island, I almost daily visited professionally the late Rev. D. Tremlett, when Dr. Kalley happening one day to call on some invalid in the same house, he was requested to see Mr. Tremlett; and he, not only examined him, but gave an opinion, opposite to that given by myself. Dr. Kalley called again the following day, without being requested to do so by Mr. Tremlett, and desired to be allowed to re-examine his chest, stating, that he did so, finding his opinion to differ from mine; on this occasion, he prescribed and pronounced his case to be merely Bronchitis, and said that he did not see any reason why Mr. Tremlett should not recover and be as healthy a man as he Dr. Kalley then was. Suffice it to say that Mr. Tremlett lingered a few months and died of Phthisis as previously predicted by me.

For the truth of this statement I beg to refer to the following —

Quinta do Payal, Feb. 2d. 1847.

My dear Sir — I willingly comply with your request to state the particulars of Dr. Kalley's professional conduct in the case of my late friend Mr. Tremlett. Finding Mr. Tremlett was not improving at San-

to Amaro, I prevailed on him to return to the town. The second day of his return, Dr. Kalley, it seems by pure accident, walked into his room at Mrs. Enoch's. Mrs. Tremlett thinking his Dr. Kalley's entrance "a God send", begged him to give her husband an examination, telling him at the time, that you were their regular medical attendant. Dr. Kalley examined Mr. Tremlett and afterwards said, that he differed greatly from you, as your opinion was given him by Mrs Tremlett. On the following morning, Dr. Kalley called on Mr. Tremlett, begging him to submit to a second examination, and after it, he assured him you had made a decided mistake in the case. I need not add how injurious the erroneous opinions to which Dr. Kalley from his double examination arrived at was to Mr. Tremlett in his weak and enfeebled state, and that for a time the positive decision of Dr. Kalley affected the confidence your patient had placed in your skill.

Your are at liberty to make whatever use of this you desire,

And I remain,

Dr Gillham.

Your's faithfully,

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

Case 2d. — During last winter I was in constant attendance on a Mr. Allen at Mr. Hollway's. When one day on visiting some other patients in the house

I was informed by Mrs. Hollway, *that Dr. Ross* had been prescribing for Mr. Allen. I never received any dismissal from Mr. Allen either before or afterwards nor any *communication* from Dr. Ross on the subject.

—

A copy of a Note from Mr. Hollway.

My dear Sir,

In reply to your note regarding your attendance upon Mr. Allen, who resided in my house during last winter, I recollect you paid him several visits, and afterwards he was attended by Dr. Ross.

I remain,

Yours truly,

11.th Feb. 1847.

JOHN HOLLWAY.

To Dr. Gillham.

—

Case 3d. — During the early part of the present winter, I was consulted by Mr. Graff who was then living at the Hotel. I attended him regularly, and when calling on him one evening, he informed me that he had that day consulted Dr. Broughton; but hoped I should not feel hurt at his having done so; he most distinctly stated that he had told Dr. Broughton, that he considered me his regular medical attendant, and

that he (Mr. Graff) merely called to solicit Dr. B.'s opinion. — Dr. Broughton examined his chest and prescribed; and the next day he Dr. B. called on him at the Hotel, when Mr. Graff repeated what he before had told him, viz that he considered me his medical man.

In corroboration of this statement I refer to the following Copy of a Letter from Mr. George Johnston.

London Hotel, 4 Feb. 1847.

Dear Doctor,

In compliance with your request I will narrate what occurred relative to your patient Mr. Graff's first consulting Dr. Broughton. About two or three weeks after Mr. Graff first consulted you, he told me that he would also consult Dr. Broughton; but that you should continue his regular medical attendant, as he liked you very much in your medical capacity and as a kind acquaintance; but he thought a person who only saw him occasionally, would remark slight changes more accurately than a person who saw him daily. I also recollect one day Mr. Graff telling me that he had been to consult Dr. Broughton, and that he (Dr. Broughton) had examined his chest. I remember also that Mr. Graff said he had told Dr. Broughton that he should continue you his medical attendant; but it was his intention to call and consult him occasionally. A day or two after Mr. Graff had

first consulted Dr. Broughton, I saw Dr. B. with him in the sitting room at the Hotel. In the course of eight or ten days, Mr. Graff consulted Dr. Broughton a second time and on his return, he expressed himself dissatisfied with Dr. B., and said that he would give Mr. Ellicott instructions to pay him.

You are at liberty to make any use of this you please.

And I am,

Yours truly,

GEORGE JOHNSTON.

To *T. Gillham Esq.*, M. D.

Case 4.th I have regularly attended Mr. Georg Johnston at the London Hotel since his arrival in Madeira, without intimating to me his intention. He consulted Dr. Broughton who examined his chest and knee, and prescribed for him as will be seen by the following copy of a note from Mr. Johnston to me.

London Hotel 5.th Feb. 1847.

Dear Doctor,

I called on Dr. Broughton on the 5.th January and showed him a prescription of yours, telling him your treatment of me. He examined my knee and chest, and prescribed for me without any hesitation, although I told him I was your patient. You are at liberty to make whatever use of this you please, and am

Yours truly,

GEORGE JOHNSTON.

T. Gillham Esq. M. D.

Since the above was sent to the press the following case has occurred.

Ever since Dr Renton left the Island I have been Mrs. French's Medical man have attended her on various occasions and on January 30.th last I was again requested to visit her and found her suffering from an inflamed bunion, to which I advised her to apply a poultice, and to give the foot rest. — On my calling upon her this day (Feb. 13) I found that Dr. Ross had been visiting a servant of a patient of mine in Mrs. French's house, when he (Dr. Ross) observing that Mrs. French walked a little lame, asked the cause, when she informed him that she had a sore toe Dr. Ross without being requested, asked to see it "contrary to all rules of professional propriety." This was granted by Mrs. French and after he had examined it, advised her to get the aforesaid bunion pared by some delicate hand, and on the following day performed that "delicate" operation himself.

I beg to refer to Mrs. French for the truth of the above.

Funchal, Feb. 13.th 1847.

T. GILLHAM, M. D.

Medicina









