

**The Christchurch Trials and Tribulations  
of Dr Adam Mickle, 1890-91**

**Geoffrey W. Rice**

University of Canterbury

HAWTHORNE PRESS

Christchurch 2020

Published by  
HAWTHORNE PRESS  
73 Halton Street  
Christchurch 8052  
NEW ZEALAND

Text © Geoffrey W. Rice

First published 2020

The moral rights of the author have been asserted.

ISBN 978-0-473-54646-5

A catalogue record for this book is available from the  
National Library of New Zealand

This book is copyright. Except for the purposes of fair review, no part may be stored or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including recording or storage in any information retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers. No reproduction may be made, whether by photocopying or any other means, unless a licence has been obtained from the publisher or its agent.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

*Black November: the 1918 Influenza Epidemic in New Zealand* (1988)

*Ambulances and First Aid: St John in Christchurch 1885-1987* (1994)

*Christchurch Changing: an illustrated history* (1999; second edition 2008)

*Heaton Rhodes of Otahuna* (2001; second edition 2008))

*Christchurch in the Nineties: a chronology* (2002)

*Lyttelton, Port and Town: an illustrated history* (2004)

*Rhodes on Cashmere: a history of the Rhodes Memorial Convalescent Home, 1886-1996*  
(2005)

*Black November: the 1918 Influenza Pandemic in New Zealand*  
(enlarged & illustrated second edition 2005)

*The Life of the Fourth Earl of Rochford (1717-1781): Eighteenth Century British Courtier,  
Diplomat and Statesman* (2010)

*All Fall Down: Christchurch's Lost Chimneys* (2011)

*Christchurch Crimes, 1850-1875: Scandal and Skulduggery in Port and Town* (2012)

*Christchurch Crimes and Scandals, 1876-1899* (2013)

*Victoria Square: Cradle of Christchurch* (2014)

*Cricketing Colonists: the Brittan Brothers in Early Canterbury*  
(with Frances Ryman, 2015)

*Black Flu 1918: the story of New Zealand's worst public health disaster* (2017)

*The Life of Leslie Averill MD* (with Colin Averill, 2018)

*That Terrible Time: Eye-witness Accounts of the 1918 Influenza Pandemic in  
New Zealand* (2018)

*A Scientific Welsh Eye-Surgeon: the Short Life of Llewellyn Powell MD, Christchurch's  
First Medical Officer of Health* (2020)

## The Christchurch Trials and Tribulations of Dr Adam Mickle, 1890-91

Christchurch medical men of the nineteenth century were a colourful crew. They included elderly former ship's doctors with dubious qualifications, experienced surgeons with excellent qualifications, physicians who made a steady income prescribing pills, and a few dedicated 'man-midwives', along with the latest products of the medical schools of Edinburgh, London and Dublin. Their quarrels not only provided entertainment for readers of the local newspapers, but occasionally spilled over into the courts, where they were more often seen as witnesses than as litigants or defendants.

One Christchurch doctor whose name appeared in the court reports of the early 1890s more often than he would have liked was Dr Adam Frederick John Mickle. He was born in 1847, the third son of a doctor in Ripon, Yorkshire. He qualified MD, BM and MS at Aberdeen before taking his licentiates LRCP and LRCS at Edinburgh. There he was a dresser for the legendary surgeon Joseph Lister, pioneer of antiseptic surgery. He was one of 18 of Lister's students who emigrated to New Zealand. The brothers John Guthrie at Akaroa and Thomas Guthrie in Christchurch were also of this cohort. When he came to Christchurch in 1875 Adam Mickle was described as a quiet, serious young man with a splendid red beard. In December 1881 he married Abigail Meredith Esmond, third daughter of Thomas Esmond Esq., of Montrose, Scotland. They eventually bought a large house on Papanui Road. Mrs Mickle, known to her friends as Annie, was an intelligent and well-educated woman who had spent some years living in Russia. In 1877 she had been in Moscow when the Czar declared war on Turkey. Later in the 1880s she gave talks in Christchurch about Russian society and literature.

When Dr Bakewell resigned from the staff of Christchurch Hospital in 1883, Dr Mickle was appointed to replace him, and at the end of that year he was put in charge of Diseases of Women and Children. He remained on the visiting medical staff at the hospital for many years, as well as maintaining an extensive private practice in the city, and was closely involved in the 1885 Christchurch Hospital Inquiry, as he had assisted at the operation by Dr Macbean Stewart which resulted in a man's death and a noisy protest by Dr Courtney Nedwill, who resigned. Though Dr Mickle was exonerated, and the hospital board later declared its full confidence in Dr Stewart, it was obvious that mistakes had been made and proper procedures had not been followed. Christchurch Hospital was clearly in great need of a shake-up and 'root and branch' reform, which it later received under Dr Walter Fox.

The subsequent libel action brought by Dr Macbean Stewart in 1886 against the Wellington *Evening Press* for publishing an article in support of Dr Nedwill had to be heard in Dunedin, as it was thought impossible to get an impartial jury in

Christchurch. Dr Mickle had to repeat much of the testimony he had already given to the Christchurch Hospital Inquiry the year before. The jury found in favour of Dr Stewart, but awarded him just one shilling in damages.

The rest of the 1880s were more peaceful for Dr Mickle and his wife, apart from two accidents in 1888 involving collisions with their horse and trap. In both cases the horse shied and overturned their vehicle, but the doctor and his wife escaped with minor cuts and bruises. They both gave generously to Herrick's relief fund for the poor, and to funds for the relief of victims of North Island bush fires, and Dr Mickle was elected surgeon to two local lodges. He was often called out to accidents and sudden deaths, and as a result was often involved in inquests. He also gave lectures in first aid on behalf of the St John Ambulance Association.

\* \* \* \* \*

However, early in 1890 Dr Mickle's private life was made public when he brought an action for slander against one Captain Everist. The case was heard before Mr Justice Denniston on 10 March. The defendant was called three times but did not appear, nor did any lawyer appear as his counsel. Denniston ordered the case to proceed as an undefended one. The special jury was sworn, and the foreman was none other than George Gatony Stead, the wealthy grain merchant and racehorse owner.

The statement of claim established that Elizabeth Everist, wife of the defendant, had been Dr Mickle's patient for about two years, and that he had attended her at her request on 30 April 1889. On several subsequent occasions, her husband had 'maliciously spoken and published' the following words:

Dr Mickle has committed adultery with Mrs Everist. I left home going to sea and missed the train. I went home again and found the door of the bedroom locked. Dr Mickle was there, and Dr Mickle came out of the room afterwards. For two years Dr Mickle has been doing as he pleased with my wife.

Even worse, it was alleged that Captain Everist had on three separate occasions accused Dr Mickle of helping his wife to procure an abortion. As a result of these accusations and the resulting gossip, Dr Mickle's practice had seriously declined, and he now claimed £1,000 in damages. (Over \$200,000 in 2020 money.)

Captain Everist's statement of defence denied all of this and alleged that if the doctor's practice had fallen off or his reputation had suffered it was not from anything Captain Everist had said or done. The statements alleged to have been made were privileged, as they had been made to the defendant's solicitor, Thomas De Renzy Harman. The statement also claimed that they were true.

Thomas Joynt appeared for Dr Mickle, and opened his case by saying that he would prove that Captain Everist had repeated his accusations of adultery and procuring abortion to a number of people, 'in the most wicked and malicious manner', knowing them to be untrue and knowing that he was thereby slandering his wife as well as her medical attendant. He said he would prove that on 30 April Mrs Everist was 'lying prostrate and enfeebled by illness', and this would be confirmed by Dr Turnbull, who had attended her during April while Dr Mickle was away. The nature of her illness, which included severe headaches, required the administration of narcotics. In her pain and distress Mrs Everist had taken all three doses at once, and had fallen into a deep sleep which lasted all day on 29 April.

When Dr Mickle was shown into her bedroom on the evening of 30 April she was wearing a dressing gown and was seated in a chair. Dr Mickle sat in another chair, and was wearing his raincoat. While they were discussing her condition Dr Mickle heard a knock at the door and a great noise of swearing. When he opened it, Captain Everist came in, complaining that the door had been locked. The servant girl had previously told Captain Everist not to make a noise as Dr Mickle was in the room with Mrs Everist. When he thought the door was locked, Captain Everist had lost his temper. Dr Mickle said the door was not locked and he had tried to pacify Captain Everist, but realised the captain had been drinking. When Captain Everist asked why Dr Mickle was there so late at night, the doctor explained that he had been busy all day and was waiting for Mrs Everist to wake from the effects of the narcotic. Dr Mickle claimed that he and the captain had parted on friendly terms. But next day Everist had gone about spreading all kinds of scandalous stories about his wife and Dr Mickle.

Joynt's summary of the case went on to say that after he had recovered from his drinking bout Captain Everist had begged his wife's forgiveness, but she had refused to have any sort of reconciliation until he had brought two of the men to whom he had slandered her name before her to refute his accusations. The two men, named Henderson and Jameson, visited her and confirmed that her husband had vilified her name. Captain Everist had then, according to their testimony, begged her forgiveness and had signed a paper disclaiming the statements he had been making about her. He had also visited Dr Mickle's surgery and made an abject apology, saying he had been drunk at the time.

Then a very strange episode had occurred at the A. & P. Show on 8 November. Captain Everist had met two men named Malcolmson and McOwen and complained to them that he had no home, repeating his previous accusations about his wife's adultery with Dr Mickle. They agreed to accompany him home and endeavour to effect a reconciliation between the Everists, taking with them some oysters as a peace-offering. However, while they were talking with Mrs Everist her husband left the room, then returned in a violent mood, smashing the glass window of the door and assaulting his

wife and his two companions. One of these, a stout gentleman, had bled rather profusely. Captain Everist maintained that he had heard Dr Mickle's voice and believed him to be closeted with his wife.

The first of the witnesses called was the solicitor Thomas De Renzy Harman, who told the court that on 28 November 1889 Dr Mickle and Captain Everist had come to his office, and Mickle had asked Everist what he meant by making slanderous statements about his wife and himself (Dr Mickle). At first Captain Everist denied having done so, but he suddenly jumped up in an excited manner and said 'I'll have my whack out of you before I have done with you!' and shook his fist at Dr Mickle. He then told Harman that he had several times come home late at night and found his wife's bedroom door locked and Dr Mickle inside with her. Dr Mickle denied that the door was ever locked.

Ebenezer Brown, manager of the Direct Importing Company, reported hearing similar allegations from Captain Everist, including the one that Dr Mickle had helped his wife procure an abortion. Brown had warned Captain Everist that these were very serious allegations, and he should not repeat them, otherwise he might find himself in serious trouble.

George Heane, a chemist's assistant, had worked at Dr Mickle's laboratory and recalled compounding prescriptions for Mrs Everist. They were either for indigestion or for neuralgia and headaches. His impression was that Mrs Everist was very ill: she had fainted in the waiting room on one occasion. On 22 November he met Captain Everist on the street and Everist had asked him if his wife ever came to the doctor's consulting room outside the usual consulting hours. Captain Everist then repeated the same story about finding Dr Mickle in his wife's bedroom with the door locked, and that when he had accused Mickle of adultery he had kicked the doctor out of his house. Heane said he had commented, 'You are rather a small man, Mr Everist, to do that', but Everist had replied, 'Never mind, I did it'.

Everist had then apparently told Heane that he had gone to town to see Mr Wynn-Williams about getting a divorce, adding that Dr Mickle had been giving his wife money, and that he himself had offered the doctor and his wife £200 or £300 to leave town. Everist had then boasted that he would make a fine living by getting money from Dr Mickle. He said that his wife's illness was a sham and a cover for adultery, and that she was like a second wife to Dr Mickle. Everist had allegedly said to Heane that he would ruin Dr Mickle wherever he could.

Alexander Henderson and James Jameson both confirmed to the court the events that Joynt had referred to in his opening address. Captain Everist had admitted that the stories he had been telling about his wife were untrue, and Henderson had suggested that he write a statement to that effect and they would witness it. Captain Everist had

said that he must have been mad or under the influence of liquor when he said those things.

Dr Robert Stewart Reed, a qualified medical practitioner from Timaru, testified that Mrs Everist had been under his care for several years before the Everists moved to Christchurch. She suffered from severe headaches, and was exhausted by years of illness, so that she could not leave the house, but lay moaning with pain day and night. As for a doctor visiting his patient late at night, Dr Reed said that no reasonable person could object to this, especially if summoned by the patient.

Dr James Somerville Turnbull said he had attended Mrs Everist earlier in April, and agreed with Dr Reed that Mrs Everist's illness was of long standing. She suffered from anaemia, depression, hysteria and sleeplessness. Where sleeplessness was part of the trouble, it was the doctor's duty to administer the narcotics in the evening, just before sleep time. He had warned Dr Mickle on his return that Mrs Everist would be his patient for a long time to come.

Finally, Mrs Annie Mickle took the stand and told the court that she had known Mrs Everist for about ten years, and they had frequently been invited to her house. Their friendship had been unbroken up to the present time. She had been at Mrs Everist's with her husband several times late at night. On the day of the Agricultural Show they had returned home by the tram. Dr Mickle had been to see a patient in Bealey Avenue and returned home about 6.30 pm. He had not gone out again that night.

After the lunch break, the jury foreman asked leave to say that, in the absence of any defence, the jury was 'perfectly satisfied' with the evidence so far presented. Mr Justice Denniston said that the evidence was being brought in order to contradict and disprove the slanders which had been circulating about Dr Mickle. In view of the foreman's statement, he asked Joynt to make the rest of his evidence as brief as possible.

The servants were among the remaining witnesses. The Everist's maid, Alice Jeffrey, remembered the evening in August when Captain Everist had returned unexpectedly from Lyttelton. She had met Dr Mickle at the door, he had taken his hat off in the dining room, and had gone into the bedroom still wearing his raincoat. When he came out he still had this top coat on. Captain Everist had come home 'very cross and the worse for liquor', and was 'very noisy'. Next day he had asked her not to say anything of what had happened, as he had been 'in drink'.

The next and most interesting witness was Mrs Everist herself. She admitted taking three doses of her narcotic at once, and that this had had a stupefying effect on her. She had slept an unusually long time and this had alarmed her friends. After she woke on 29 April, her husband left to join his ship by the 10 pm train. He had been drinking.

Dr Mickle came at her request shortly after, and was shown into the front room, which she was using both as a sitting room and a bedroom. He had been with her no more than a quarter of an hour when Captain Everist returned. Dr Mickle was explaining to her the effect of taking three doses at once when she heard her husband swearing at the door. She went out to ask if he had left anything behind, but he would not speak to her. Dr Mickle helpfully said there was a later train, and they left the house together. She did not hear any hostile language between them. Her husband had returned about 3 am and said that Dr Mickle had given her £100 as 'hush-money'. She added that her husband had often asked her to try to get money in this way. Mrs Everist had then sent for her brother-in-law and his wife, and in their presence Captain Everist had admitted that what he had said about a cheque was untrue. Likewise, in the presence of Jameson and Henderson, her husband had admitted that the things he had been saying about her and Dr Mickle were untrue, and he had signed a paper to that effect. She would swear on oath that on the evening Dr Mickle visited her the door of the room was not locked.

Dr Mickle himself then took the stand and repeated most of the points made in his statement of claim, insisting that nothing improper had ever taken place between himself and Mrs Everist. He said he had certainly never discussed procuring an abortion for her. His practice had suffered considerably from the gossip caused by Captain Everist's allegations. Joynt then summed up, and asked the jury to award substantial damages in order to vindicate Dr Mickle's honour and professional reputation. A medical man more than any other had to be protected in a case like this, for his patients relied on his professionalism to attend female patients whenever necessary. Captain Everist had signed a deed of separation with his wife, and yet had continued to spread slander abroad about Dr Mickle. He asked the jury to show what they thought of such 'dastardly conduct'.

In his summing up, Mr Justice Denniston endorsed Joynt's remarks, adding that there was 'not the slightest scintilla of evidence' to support Captain Everist's allegations. The allegation of procuring an abortion was especially serious for a medical man. He also agreed with Joynt that a small amount in damages would only encourage some deluded people to think that there had been some truth in the allegations.

The foreman of the jury then asked whether the amount of damages should be computed according to the means and position of the defendant, but the judge said very firmly that they should not. The jury took only eight minutes to find in favour of Dr Mickle and to award him the full amount claimed.

An editorial in *The Press* on 11 March 1890 confidently predicted that the public would 'cordially agree' with the jury's verdict. As a general rule the paper had little sympathy for actions for slander. Where ordinary people were concerned, it was far better to remain silent and let the truth prevail in the end with those whose good opinion is

worth having. But the allegations against Dr Mickle were altogether different, and he had to vindicate himself in public in order to continue in his profession. Fortunately he was able to do this, in an unusually complete and thorough refutation by reputable witnesses. The defendant Captain Everist had not dared appear in court. Even before all of the witnesses had been heard the jury announced that they were satisfied the defendant's statements had been slanderous and untrue, and the judge had taken the unusual but very proper course of agreeing with them.

The editorial writer thought it had been hard on Dr Mickle that he was put to the trouble and expense of a law suit in order to clear his name, but other members of the medical profession ought to be grateful to him for having done so, as it might give pause to other people who might be tempted to spread slanderous gossip about their medical attendants. The writer thought it 'utterly incredible' that Captain Everist had retracted and apologised for his allegations in writing, with the excuse that he had been the worse for drink when he made them, but had then repeated them when sober, 'in the vilest and most aggravated form', and finally, when challenged in a court of law, had skulked away without defending his conduct. He had slandered not only Dr Mickle but also his own sick wife, whose only fault seems to have been that she was a great deal too good for him.

Whether or not Captain Everist ever paid Dr Mickle his £1,000 in damages is not known.

\* \* \* \*

Unfortunately for Dr Mickle, he found himself back in the same court a year later, this time as the defendant facing a charge of medical malpractice. The amount claimed in damages was exactly the same, £1,000. The case was heard before Mr Justice Denniston and a jury of twelve men.

A young labourer with the distinctive name of Augustus Chipper had been cutting wood with a tomahawk at the Styx on 12 September 1888 when he accidentally cut his left leg below the knee. According to his statement of claim, his employer's wife washed and dressed the small wound, and put him on the train to return to Christchurch. He later went to see Dr Mickle at his surgery in Colombo Street, and Dr Mickle put some lint on the wound and bound it up. He told Chipper to go home and rest, and not to remove the bandage until he came to see him again in a few days' time.

According to Chipper, Dr Mickle did not come for another ten days. In the meantime the plaintiff's mother had bought some lotion from a chemist to apply to the wound. By 22 September the wound was very painful, and the mother went to see Dr Mickle.

He apparently told her to put a poultice on the wound. Next day, a Sunday, some oil ran out of the wound, so Dr Mickle was called. He felt the leg, looked at the wound, and told the man's mother to add some linseed oil to the poultice. He said he would return the next day but did not come back until the Friday. By then the leg was swollen and bent. The mother asked if she should straighten it, but Dr Mickle said it was better to let it adopt whatever position was least painful. He ordered the poultices to be continued and said he would come next day, but did not. The plaintiff's mother called another doctor, and her son was taken to the hospital in a cab. He remained at the hospital for many weeks, and he could not remember much of what happened there. The leg was finally amputated on 4 November.

Thomas Joynt again appeared to defend Dr Mickle, and cross-examined the plaintiff Chipper. The cut was only an inch long but it bled a great deal. By the time Dr Mickle saw it the wound was clean and dry. Chipper could not remember being prescribed 'absolute rest'. He thought he had only got up 'when compelled by necessity'. He remembered his leg being opened twice while he was in the hospital. He could not recall telling the hospital dresser, Richard Brown, that he had gone for walks in the garden, nor that the leg was getting on all right until he did so. He remembered tubes being taken out of the wound at the hospital, but could not recall them being put in. He did not remember taking them out himself. He thought the nurses had been 'pretty cruel sometimes'. He did not know that his behaviour had caused them trouble.

In answer to a question from Walter Stringer, his own counsel, the plaintiff said that he could not recall that Dr Mickle had ever taken his temperature.

Dr Henry Ovenden was one of the visiting surgeons at Christchurch Hospital and had seen Chipper the morning after his admission. He found the knee joint full of pus, with a small wound below the knee. He syringed the joint with carbolic acid solution, and laid the wound open. He ordered a course of treatment with poultices. After a few days the patient's temperature went down, but the knee joint did not improve and finally the leg had to be amputated.

Under cross-examination, Dr Ovenden said that Chipper had been somewhat delirious the night before a second incision was made. The nurses said he had been troublesome and kept removing his bandages. Dr Ovenden said he would not care to leave a wound four or five days without looking at it, but he could not comment on Dr Mickle's treatment as he did not know how he had been treating the wound. If the wound was clean and not gaping there was usually no need to stitch it. If no pain occurred in the first ten days, that was a good sign. But the wound ought to have healed in less time than that. Rest was very important. If a wound was septic, a

poultice might make it worse. Not all pus was septic, but that oozing from Chipper's wound was highly septic.

The hospital dresser, Richard Brown, told the court that he had been at the hospital for twenty years and had 'a large acquaintance with the history and character of wounds'. He remembered Chipper's admission. The wound, about two inches below the knee, was partly healed but somewhat inflamed. There was no pus apparent. Dr De Renzi ordered hot fomentations to be placed on the wound, and this treatment was continued for six days. After the fifth day the knee began to swell and it was obvious that pus was forming. Dr Ovenden put the patient under ether and made a second incision from which the pus drained away.

Unfortunately, Chipper then began taking out the drainage tubes and removing the bandages, two or three times a day. The wound got worse, and again an incision had to be made to drain the pus, but the patient objected to having 'gas pipes in his leg' and pulled them out repeatedly. Brown thought that Chipper was excitable and hysterical at times, but not delirious. He seemed quite conscious throughout. But he was 'unusually refractory', and the nurses found him difficult to handle. Brown could not recall a more difficult patient.

Three of the nurses were then called to testify, and confirmed Brown's description of Chipper's behaviour. Christina Cameron said, 'He was a very troublesome patient, taking off the dressings and taking out the drainage tubes several times'. Alice Smith said that Chipper had always been very difficult to manage, and when hot fomentations were applied he would pull them off, saying 'he would be d----d if he would have them on'.

Dr Mickle told the court that he had studied antiseptic treatment under Sir Joseph Lister, its inventor, and had followed the correct procedure in dressing Chipper's wound when he first saw him. He had carefully washed the wound inside and out with an antiseptic solution of carbolic acid and was very particular to check that there was nothing in the wound. He drew the edges of the wound together with tape and applied carbolised lint over it. He then bandaged the leg, carrying the dressing above the knee to prevent it from slipping down. There was no need whatever for a splint, and the wound was at least two inches below the joint. Dr Mickle insisted that he had told Chipper to go home and give the leg 'perfect rest'. But the patient had departed without giving his name or address.

Mrs Rose Chipper had come to see Dr Mickle on the Saturday a week later and told him that her son was in pain, though the wound seemed to be healing well. When asked what her son had been doing, she said he had not stayed in bed but had been up

and about, in the house and in the garden. He had removed the dressing himself. Dr Mickle advised her to put carbolised oil on the wound and cover it with a poultice. She had not asked him to visit her son, but had merely come to ask for advice.

On the Monday, however, Mrs Chipper had returned to Dr Mickle and asked him to come at once, and he did. The wound was slightly inflamed at one end, and seemed to be heated. There was no indication of pus or fluid. The patient complained that the leg was stiff and sore. Dr Mickle ordered complete bed rest and continued poultices. He thought that the inflammation had been caused by standing or walking on the leg.

In his judgement, Dr Mickle told the court, there was no danger in leaving such a small wound for four or five days. He went back to see Chipper of his own accord on the Friday but he was not there. His mother said he had just gone out. He was certainly not in bed. When Dr Mickle finally inspected the wound it was still open at one end and there was no discharge, though the swelling had increased somewhat. When he saw it again on the Monday the knee was swollen and the wound was 'rather inflamed and angry'. Mrs Chipper said she thought her son should go to the hospital, as she was unable to manage him at home.

Dr Mickle insisted that there was no discharge from the wound when Chipper took himself off to the hospital. He thought Dr Ovenden may have muddled his dates and described the wound as it appeared a few days later. Dr Mickle had been 'very much astonished' to hear of the later amputation. In his opinion the disturbance of the antiseptic dressing by the patient had increased suppuration. Removing drainage tubes was 'very dangerous', and this alone would account for the case turning out badly.

In support of Dr Mickle, Dr Francis Macbean Stewart and Dr Henry Horsford Prins, both surgeons at Christchurch Hospital, told the court that they believed his treatment had been correct, and that the patient was himself responsible for the worsening of his condition because he had not obeyed the doctor's orders. Dr Prins said he had often consulted Dr Mickle on medical and surgical cases and considered him 'a most painstaking and skilful man'. No other treatment than the one followed by Dr Mickle could have produced better results; indeed, the hospital staff had continued the same regime of poultices.

After Thomas Joynt had completed his address for the defence, Walter Stringer replied on behalf of the plaintiff, and started by saying that if he had known what had happened at the hospital he would not have imputed lack of skill or any negligence on Dr Mickle's part. He could not hold Dr Mickle liable for the loss of the leg. But he thought it was still open to the jury to find a verdict on the treatment or lack thereof

before the plaintiff went into hospital. Stringer admitted that his client's behaviour in the hospital deprived him of the claim that Dr Mickle was responsible for the loss of his leg.

Mr Justice Denniston then told the jury that while these admissions by Mr Stringer altered the case more than somewhat, they should still give the plaintiff's claim their 'greatest possible attention'. The jury, however, took just five minutes to return a verdict in favour of Dr Mickle.

After the strain of this second court case Dr Mickle took his wife off for a holiday at Hanmer Springs in North Canterbury and no doubt spent time relaxing in the thermal pool. He was next in the news in Christchurch in June 1891 calling for a system of volunteer nurses to care for the poor in their own homes, and was one of the first to contribute to a fund for the relief of poverty in the city in August. He continued to lecture in first aid for the St John Ambulance Association, and was persuaded to offer himself for election as a city councillor for the North-East Ward in 1896, so his reputation had not suffered from either of the court cases.

He did not enjoy city council politics as much as he had expected, and resigned from the council in 1897 in order to take Mrs Mickle on a trip back to England. They sailed to San Francisco and then went by rail to attend a meeting of the British Medical Association in Montreal. They stopped at Chicago on the way, which Dr Mickle described as 'huge, ugly, busy and noisy'. They were away for nine months altogether, visiting his mother in Yorkshire before travelling through Germany to Russia, where Mrs Mickle spent six weeks revisiting old friends. Dr Mickle was an active fund-raiser during both the Boer War of 1899-1902 and the First World War, and gave valiant service during the great influenza pandemic of 1918, taking over four of the city's relief 'blocks' when Dr Manning fell ill.

Dr Mickle retired in 1929, after 54 years of medical practice in Christchurch, and went to live near the seaside at New Brighton. There he did a great deal of unpaid work among the unemployed, despite his own failing health, and greatly endeared himself to the poor of the district by his kindness. He died in 1935 at the age of 88.

-----

#### SOURCES:

*Lyttelton Times*, Christchurch  
*The Press*, Christchurch