

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

1

887 and 888

Die Veneris, 6^o Julii 1838.

The Lord WHARNCLIFFE in the Chair.

Evidence on the Operation of the Poor Law Amendment Act.

ROBERT WEALE Esquire is called in, and further examined as follows :

HAVE you prepared a Return showing the Number of Paupers in the Workhouse of the Bridgwater Union weekly, from the Ninth Week of the Quarter ending the 25th of December 1837 to the Twelfth Week of the Quarter ending the 24th of June 1838? I have.

Have the goodness to deliver it in?

The same is delivered in and read, and is as follows. The Witness is directed to withdraw.

| CLASS | WEEK OF THE QUARTER ENDING 25 DECEMBER 1837 | | | | | WEEK OF THE QUARTER ENDING 25 MARCH 1838 | | | | | | | | | | | WEEK OF THE QUARTER ENDING 24 JUNE 1838 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 9 TH | 10 TH | 11 TH | 12 TH | 13 TH | 1 ST . | 2 ND | 3 RD | 4 TH | 5 TH | 6 TH | 7 TH | 8 TH | 9 TH | 10 TH | 11 TH | 12 TH | 13 TH | 1 ST . | 2 ND | 3 RD | 4 TH | 5 TH | 6 TH | 7 TH | 8 TH | 9 TH | 10 TH | 11 TH | 12 TH | 13 TH |
| MEN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ABLE-BODIED | — | — | — | — | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TEMPORARILY DISABLED | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3 | — |
| OLD AND INFIRM | 17 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 19 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 | — |
| YOUTHS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | — |
| FROM 9 TO 16 YEARS | 23 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 22 | 23 | 30 | 30 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 29 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 14 | 21 | — |
| BOYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | — |
| FROM 2 TO 9 YEARS | 31 | 32 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 34 | 24 | 27 | 38 | 39 | 37 | 35 | 36 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 38 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 38 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 38 | 38 | 38 | — |
| WOMEN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | — |
| ABLE-BODIED | 8 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | — | |
| TEMPORARILY DISABLED | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 19 | — |
| OLD AND INFIRM | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 27 | — |
| GIRLS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | — |
| FROM 9 TO 16 YEARS | 20 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 28 | | 29 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 31 | 28 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 26 | 24 | 24 | |
| FROM 2 TO 9 YEARS | 28 | 29 | 28 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 27 | 30 | 21 | 19 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 29 | 30 | 20 | 29 | 25 | 30 | 27 | 29 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 24 | 24 | |
| INFANTS | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | — |
| TOTALS | 170 | 172 | 174 | 173 | 178 | 174 | 174 | 192 | 200 | 195 | 191 | 191 | 206 | 223 | 225 | 223 | 225 | 225 | 218 | 200 | 213 | 203 | 208 | 198 | 190 | 194 | 195 | 193 | 191 | 183 | — |

Average, 196

6th July 1838

Robert Weale
Assistant Poor Law Commissioner

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

3

889

Mr. JOHN BOWEN is called in, and further examined as follows :

THE next Point of which you complain in the Bridgwater Union is with respect to the Neglect of the Matron's Applications for Assistance by giving her a Nurse for certain Children who were ill in the Month of October 1836?

I merely copied these Entries from the Book, and put them down as they were; I know nothing about them; I was never in the Petherton Workhouse in my Life.

Is that the Case with respect to those on the 20th of March and 17th of April 1837, referred to in Page 173 of the Papers referred to the Committee?

Yes; I put them down without any individual Knowledge. I found, on going through the Petherton Visitors Book, there were repeated Instances of Applications being made by Magistrates and other Visitors which were not attended to, even on so trifling a Matter as Hair-cutting, where the Heads of the Children were neglected until they became eaten out with Vermin, or at least eaten into Ulcers. There are Entries on that Subject, commencing 17th September 1836. The Question in the Visitors Book is, " Do the Inmates of the Workhouse of all Classes appear cleanly in their Persons?" The Answer, 17th September 1836, is, " The Matron has paid 2s. 6d. for having the Children's Hair cut, with my Sanction. "

By whom is that signed?

Richard King Meade King who is a Magistrate, and was the Vice Chairman. " In future Hair to be cut by a Pauper from the Bridgwater Workhouse." The next Entry is 2d May 1837; the Answer is, " Yes, but some Persons wanted immediately to cut the Children's Hair, without which they cannot be kept clean. " Signed by the same Gentleman.

Do you know how far those Directions of his were obeyed?

No, except as will appear from the Entries subsequently. " June 29th. The Children's Hair requires cutting.-- July 4th. Yes; but no one has been sent to cut the Children's Hair, as requested last Week. " Signed by the same Gentle man. " 13th. No Attention has been paid to the repeated Requests of the Visitors and the Matron, with respect to the Hair-cutting of the Children. " Signed « Henry Parsons, " another Magistrate of the County. " July 21st. No one has yet been sent to cut the Children's Hair, as requested for several Weeks.-September 27th. Yes; but the Children's Hair must be cut; a Person should be sent from the Bridgwater Workhouse, as usual, to do it. "

Those Gentlemen are ex officio Guardians of the Union?

Yes; One of them is resident in that Parish, Petherton; and I mention this not offensively to

these Guardians, but to show that there were Applications Month after Month not attended to. October 4th, it is entered, " The Children's Hair is cut, but some have bad Heads. Signed Henry Parsons. " I inquired of the Gentleman who made the Entry, and the Governor of the Bridgwater House, what was meant by bad Heads, and was informed it was that the Children's Heads were full of Vermin and eaten into Ulcers.

You do not know that to be the Fact?

No; but that was the Answer I received.

Who told you so?

The Governor of the Bridgwater Workhouse.

The Entry refers to Petherton Workhouse?

Yes; but though the Children were sent to Petherton Workhouse there was no Governor there; the Provisions and Articles were sent from the Bridgwater Workhouse.

Those Children were not sent to the Bridgwater Workhouse to have their Hair cut?

No. I beg it to be understood that I know nothing of it of my own Knowledge.

What is the Name of the Governor of the Bridgwater Workhouse from whom you received that Information?

Mr. Gover. Mr. Parsons said that they had sore Heads and were lousy, and I asked Mr. Gover what it meant, and he said that the Children whom he saw once a Week were 890 lousy and eaten into Sores. I was asked as to Applications for Assistance in the House; I have copied out a few of the Entries. On the 8th of August 1836, " The Inmates are all healthy, except Three old Women bedridden, and One Woman with diseased Spine. Two or Three of the Children are poorly. " That was at the Commencement of the Union. Very soon after, " There are at present Five able-bodied Females in the House who are employed in household Work. " The next is October 28th : " Nineteen Children continue afflicted with the Measles; Ann Day is still confined to her Bed : Jane Morley is very poorly, supposed to be an Affection of the Lungs; she has been ordered Tea and Sugar by the Medical Officer, but it has not been supplied. "

You read this not to prove the State of the Paupers, but to prove the Neglect in furnishing the Supplies which were required?

Yes. That Entry is followed by " The Matron wants the Assistance of an able-bodied Washerwoman without Delay. "

Did you make Inquiry with respect to that Tea and Sugar?

No.

You did not learn whether that Woman had had Tea and Sugar supplied to her from another Place?

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

4

I was not a Guardian at the Time; I merely took the Entries from the Book.

Does it appear from subsequent Entries that they were not supplied?

The most important Entry on that Subject is 10th March 1836 of the Surgeon of the Petherton Workhouse, Mr. Tilsley. " There has been occasionally much Delay in sending the Articles entered as Necessaries for the Patients. In many Instances, although ordered by the Board, a Week or more has elapsed. " Now I do not know that Fact; but I find it signed by the Surgeon.

Can you refer to any Instance in which a poor Woman who had been ordered by the Surgeon Tea and Sugar from the Workhouse was supplied by the Charity of the Surgeon.

The Name of the Woman was Harriet Bindon. There is her own Affidavit on the Subject, a Copy of which was furnished by Mr. Weale in Page 29 of the printed Papers before your Lordships.

Where do you find the Fact stated of her getting the Tea and Sugar from the Charity of the Surgeon when she could not get it from the Workhouse?

It is stated in her Affidavit, " Deponent believes that Two or Three Days elapsed after Mr. Tilsley said she should have Tea and Sugar before it was given her; then Mr. Tilsley gave her some for Two or Three Days, when she was told the Matron had received some for her from Bridgwater. "

It was a Week before she got it from the Matron, having none for Two or Three Days, and being supplied by the Medical Man Two or Three Days?

Yes.

That was before the new Workhouse was built?

Yes; it was in the Petherton Workhouse. Perhaps it will throw some Light on that Woman's Case if your Lordships will turn to the Medical Return of January the 31st. Her Name, Harriet Bindon, appears as being ill of Influenza. On February the 7th the same Woman is stated to be ill of Influenza; February the 14th, Inflammation of the Windpipe, with this Entry : " Should be allowed Tea and Butter. " Therefore it appears that though on the 31st of January she was placed on the Doctor's List as labouring under Influenza, it was not till the 14th of February that Tea and Butter were ordered for her.

Of what do you produce that as a Proof?

Only that the Woman was very ill, and had been very ill some Time before Tea was ordered at all.

That is in fact a Complaint against the Medical Person for not having ordered it?

I merely state the fact as it appears upon the Book.

891 *Is that stated to show their Lordships a Neglect on the Part of the Persons. connected with the Workhouse not attending to the Order of the Medical Officer, or a Want of Attention on the Part of the Medical Officer?*

I state those Facts to show a Want of Attention to the Poor, without applying them to any Person. I do not bring forward a Charge against any one; I only state such Facts as stand on Record.

Do you think there were no Instances of Neglect on the Part of the Officers of the Workhouse under the old System?

Certainly; but the Overseer, under such Circumstances, would have been liable to Prosecution.

Supposing those Gentlemen neglected their Duty, do you suppose it never happened that a Medical Man under the old System neglected a Pauper under his Care?

I cannot say.

How do you mean that the Overseer would be prosecuted?

I say he might be prosecuted.

Had you Medical Knowledge enough, or Information enough, to ascertain that that Woman required Tea and Butter before the 14th of February?

I leave it to your Lordships to determine whether this Woman, labouring under Influenza for Fourteen Days, had not Room to complain that not a Drop of Tea nor a Bit of Butter was allowed her. I should say that any Person ill, whether a poor Woman or otherwise, should have a little Tea and Butter.

It is your Opinion that the Medical Attendant neglected his Duty, or was ignorant of the Functions he had undertaken, by not ordering Tea and Butter sooner?

My Observation would go further than that, that such a Woman should not be put on Gruel, and should be found Tea and Butter.

You mean to say the Medical Officer should have recommended those Things for her sooner?

Your Lordships must take the Entry, and put your own Constructions on it; I take the Entry as I find it.

You produce it as Proof of the Neglect of the Medical Officer?

No; as Proof of the Suffering of the Woman

How do you know that the Woman suffered?

I take for granted that any Privation of that Kind must inflict Suffering.

You think it would produce Suffering, do you?

Yes.

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

5

Supposing the Woman did not like Tea and Sugar?

Then it would not have been ordered for her on the 14th.

How do you know that?

I cannot answer as to all the Possibilities of the Case.

Do not you presume that there was Hardship inflicted upon her in that respect?

I presume Hardship.

If the Medical Person had thought it necessary for this Woman's State of Health that she should have the Tea and Butter upon the first of those Days, do you suppose he would have ordered it?

From knowing something of the Man I conceive he would; but he might conceive he was not at liberty to break in upon the System.

If he had thought that this Tea and Butter was necessary for the Woman on the first Day, do you suppose he would not have ordered it?

I suppose so; I only speak on the Fact.

Then the fact is simply this, that the Medical Person did not order it on the first Day?

Yes.

892 *Which he might have ordered if he had thought it necessary for her?*

No Doubt of that.

He did order it on the 14th?

Yes.

She had none from the Officers of the Workhouse for One Week after that?

Two or Three Days, and then Two or Three Days. On February 17th, the Entry stands in the Visiting Book, " The Tea and Sugar ordered by the Medical Officer for Harriet Bindon has not been provided. "

You mean to say there was a Fault, first on the Part of the Medical Officer in not ordering the Tea and Sugar till the 14th, and then the Fault of its not being provided on the 14th?

I merely state the Hardship to which the Woman was subjected.

How do you know that she was subjected to Hardship?

I only suppose that she was subjected to it by the Privation; I never saw her.

Have you ever heard from her own Friends that she suffered?

No; but I presume that when such a Person is ill she requires all those little Indulgences.

Are you a better Judge of that than the Medical Person who attended her?

No, certainly not.

Then what makes you take upon you, not having seen her, to say that she ought to have it?

I never have seen an Instance where a Person being ill did not require some little Indulgences.

Your Evidence goes upon the general Notion that when a Person is ill she must have Tea and Butter?

Yes; and upon the general Experience.

If the Medical Officer says this ought to be given to any one, and in consequence of its not being given he provides it out of his own Pocket, is not that a strong Proof that he considered that she was suffering Hardship?

It is the strongest Proof of his Opinion.

That refers only to the Circumstances which occurred after the 14th?

Yes.

Have you seen the Dietary?

Yes.

Do you not know that there is a Note on that Dietary, " The sick to be dieted as directed by the Medical Officer "?

I know that perfectly.

You ascribe all this, which you state to be Neglect on the Part of the Medical Officer and on the Party providing the Things when ordered, to a Desire of the Board of Guardians to be as saving of Money as possible?

I think that would be a Conclusion that, on this particular Part of the Case, I should not be desirous to arrive at.

What is the Inference you draw from these Circumstances?

I consider that I am called here to give your Lordships a Statement of Facts, leaving you to draw your own Inferences from them.

You have published a Pamphlet in which you make strong Accusations; the Committee wish to know how you apply the Facts so as to warrant you in making those strong Inferences?

If your Lordships will be pleased to call my Attention to any Inference of mine I will endeavour to explain it.

You have drawn an Inference, and stated, that the Medical Person not ordering a Woman Tea and Sugar was a Proof of Neglect on his Part; how do
893 *you mean to apply that Instance of Neglect to the Conduct of the Board of Guardians?*

The only Observations I make upon it are the only ones which I think I can be called upon by this Committee to explain or substantiate. In Page 73 of the printed Papers I have stated, " Here are the Matron's reiterated Applications for Assistance to clean and nurse the wretched Sufferers under her Care; here are the Surgeon's Pleadings for a little Tea, or some such Indulgence, for those whose enfeebled Stomachs reject the nauseous Meal and Water; and here is indubitable Proof that a Week or more in many

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

6

Instances passed over the. pining Child or bedridden Adult without bringing to their parched Lips the prescribed Relief."

Will you read the next Paragraph?

" Awful as all this is, there are other Facts connected with the working of the Machinery for grinding the Poor in the Bridgwater Union of a still darker Character. "

Do you give those Facts you have mentioned as Part of the Machinery for grinding the Poor in the Bridgwater Union?

Yes, they are a Part.

What do you mean by grinding the Poor in the Bridgwater Union?

I mean subjecting them to Hardship and Suffering they ought not to be subjected to.

For what Purpose do you attribute that grinding the Poor?

Cutting down the Poor Rates.

Do you mean that the Surgeon's abstaining from ordering Tea and Butter previous to the 14th was part of the Machinery for grinding the Poor in the Bridgwater Union?

No; I do not apply it to any particular Part; I mean that the System of making the Poorhouse a Place of Punishment,-not those particular Circumstances of the saving of a 1d. or 1½d. or 2d., but the general System,-has the Effect of grinding down the Poor.

Do you mean that the Fact you have just given in Evidence, that th abstained from ordering Butter till the 14th., is an Element in that general System of grinding down the Poor in the Bridgwater Union?

I think not; I merely notice this Paper to commence with the first Entry I find in the Medical weekly Return opposite to that Woman's Name.

Not as Part of your Evidence leading to the Conclusion which you state in that Pamphlet?

No. I beg to observe it does not appear in my Pamphlet; if at the Time I had considered it important I should have copied it out.

Is it your Opinion that a Number of those Cases had a Tendency to render Persons disgusted with the Workhouse, and make them wish to go out?

Yes.

This was before the new Workhouse was provided?

Yes.

Some little Time must elapse on all Occasions before Things can be got into Order?

Yes; Allowances should be made for that.

Have you any other Instance; can you refer to the Orders made from Time to Time from which it appears that there were similar Instances of Delay in

delivering those Things the Medical Man thought necessary?

I have not copied out any other.

Can you refer the Committee to any Orders for additional Assistance in the Workhouse for Nurses, and so on?

I have referred to Instances to that Effect

Can you state any thing as to the Children in the Workhouse, or any Number of them being affected by the Itch?

Upon the Paper on your Lordships Table, No. 177, Page 19,-this Paper was moved for by 894 Noble Lord in the Chair, at my Request, to show not that Sixty-five Persons had the Itch, but that the Entries in the Bridgwater Visiting Book did not deserve the smallest Credit-the First Question is, " Is the House clean and well ventilated in every Part; if not, state Particulars of every Defect or Omission?" The Answer is, " Yes. " That is signed by the Visitor, " James Somers. "

Who is James Somers?

A Member of the Visiting Committee.

Is he a Magistrate?

No; he is a Farmer. The Second Question is, " Are the Inmates generally healthy, or is there any Sickness prevalent among them; if so, state Particulars, and especially if any dangerous or highly infectious Cases of Illness exist in the House?" The Answer is, " They are generally healthy. " A Magistrate, the Reverend Henry Parsons, goes into the House, and he says, " I went round the Wards with Mr. Ward, the Medical Officer, on Sunday the 31st of December, and found that no less than Sixty-three Children were afflicted with the Itch, some of them in a great Degree, and that the Children who were supposed to have introduced the Infection were admitted into the House without previous Examination. I further noticed that the Atmosphere of the Wards was generally very offensive; and upon Inquiry I was informed that there was not a sufficient Supply of Water to cleanse the Water Closets; and I request that an immediate Investigation of these Matters of Complaint may be had. "

That you produce as a Proof that the Entry in the Visitors Book is not always to be depended upon?

Yes.

Was Mr. Parsons an ex officio Guardian?

Yes. If your Lordships will be pleased to turn to the Bridgwater Medical Return for the same Days you will find that the Sixty-three Children having the Itch are not noticed there; therefore it is possible for Children to that Number to have the Itch without its being noticed there.

Was Mr. Ward the Medical Officer in charge of the Bridgwater House at that Time?

He was.

By whom were all those Questions framed which

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

7

appear in Page 19?

They are in printed Books, with a blank Space left for Answers; and the Visitors for the Week are expected to write opposite to each Question the Answer.

Those Books are sent from the Commissioners?

Yes; and are produced on the Table of the Board of Guardians every Week by Order of the Commissioners.

When Mr. Underdown, the Clerk, signs this which has been signed by the Visitors, does he sign it as agreeing with his own Observation, or merely attesting the Signatures of the Visitors?

Merely as attesting the Signature of the Visitors; he was directed to furnish a Copy, and he attested the Accuracy of the Copy.

Have you had any Conversation with Mr. Parsons touching that Remark made upon the Visitors Book?

Not One Word; I did not think it proper.

You never asked him how far he had brought that Subject before the Board?

I did not.

Have you referred to the Minute Book to see how far Notice was taken by Mr. Parsons, or any Motion made, in consequence of the State in which he found the Workhouse at that Time?

I think I have turned over the Minute Book without finding any thing; if so it was only for One or Two Weeks after the Time; I think I looked to Two. subsequent Entries, but I do not think I went beyond that.

895 *Have you ever heard from anybody that Mr. Parsons's Entry, so contrary to the Entry made by Mr. Somers, and by Mr. Ward the Medical Officer, became the Subject of Discussion at the Board?*

I never heard that it did; but I cannot speak from my own Knowledge.

Can you account for Mr. Parsons not having brought the Matter before the Board?

Certainly not.

Can you account for the Board not inquiring into it?

Certainly not.

Do you know that the Board did not inquire into it?

I do not. I notice this only for the Purpose of showing that those Books which are presumed to be a Check upon the Proceedings of the Board bear Falsehoods upon their Face; that those Two Entries cannot be true; but I cannot step in between the Parties, and determine which speaks the Truth..

If you will turn again to Page 73 of the printed

Papers you say, that " some Time after the Introduction of the new System, it appears from the Visitor's Book that the prescribed Dietary was not rigidly observed ;' in what Part of the Visitor's Book do you find that?

In Reply to the Question No. 10, "Is the established Dietary duly observed?" on the 2d of August 1836, it is said, " Yes, except Milk for Oatmeal; " the 9th of August, " Yes, except Milk for Oatmeal. "

What is the Report with respect to the Health of the Inmates at that Time?

The first Report is the 22d of July, " Generally healthy "; the 2d of August, " Generally healthy "; the 9th of August, " Generally healthy "; the 16th of August, " No peculiar Sickness. " The Answer to the Question, No. 10, was " Except the Use of Milk, as recommended by the Medical Officer, in lieu of Gruel. " 16th of August, 23d of August, " Generally healthy; Gruel is now used instead of Milk; " the 30th of August, " Generally healthy. "

Will you refer to Page 73 of the Papers; you will see that on the 23d of August, after the words "Gruel is now used instead of Milk," there occur these Words, " Gruel is now used strictly according to the Dietary "?

That is in the Petherton Book.

In that Case in the Bridgwater Workhouse the Entry is " Gruel is now used instead of Milk "?

Yes.

You say in this Pamphlet, that " This Allowance of Milk was violently opposed as being too greatly opposed to the Regulations of the Commissioners to be tolerated; " where does that appear?

It does not appear; I heard it at the Time from different Guardians.

There is no Document from which you prove it?

No.

Were you a Guardian at that Time?

No; nor for Six Months after that.

You heard from some Guardians that that was violently opposed?

Yes.

Who were the Persons from whom you heard that?

Mr. Baker was one who told me so.

Did he refer you to any Motion made that the Milk should be continued, or that it should be discontinued?

No.

Your Informant was Mr. Baker?

Yes; and the Thing was generally spoken of.

Do you know how far the Medical Persons had become reconciled to the Gruel being used instead of Milk previous to the 23d of August?

No farther than your Lordships may infer

from this Letter : on the 25th of October
896 Mr. King says, " On resuming my Duties at the
Workhouse I found that the Board had ordered that
Oatmeal should be used for the Children instead of Milk. "

*The Question is, whether the Medical Person at
the Time referred to, was consenting to the Alteration
of the Diet back again to Gruel?*

I am not able to state that; but the Medical
Man was repeatedly told that he had nothing to
do with the Dietary of healthy Persons; that the
Regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners
determined that.

*How do you know that he was repeatedly told
that?*

I think I have heard either Twice or Three
Times Declarations of that Sort at the Board

That was afterwards, when you were a Guardian?

Yes.

*The Question refers to the Time before you were a
Guardian?*

I have no Means of proving that, and I do not
assert it.

*Does what you refer to mean this, that if a Man is
in perfect Health he must abide by the Regulations
and the Diet of the Workhouse?*

Yes.

*It does not mean to say that if a Surgeon is of
opinion that any Person requires Milk or any thing
else he may not order it?*

If he is put on the Sick List.

*If any able-bodied Pauper does require Milk in the
Opinion of the Medical Man, would he not be
allowed it?*

I should consider that the Medical Man has
nothing to do with the Diet of Persons who
were not on his List. I have heard those Words
used myself at the Board.

*He has the Power of putting any Person on his
List for the Purpose of ordering him a particular
Diet?*

I do not know that he has; I know he merely
puts Persons on his List on account of Disease.

*Can he put a Man on his List if he is not ill,
notwithstanding he thinks he will be ill the next
Day?*

I believe not.

*Suppose he considered that a Man who is in
excellent Health requires Milk, would he not be at
liberty to put him on his List?*

Not unless he put him on the Sick List, and
then some Disease would be carried out against
his Name; if the Man was diseased to such an
Extent as to justify the Surgeon's carrying out
his Disease on the Book against him he might

order him what he pleased.

*Might he not know, from the State of several of his
Patients, that a particular Diet was producing a
certain Disease, and might he not think, therefore,
that it would be desirable, even with respect to those
who were well, to order a particular Diet?*

Certainly.

*Had he Power to order that Diet with respect to
those who were well?*

I conceive not; and that Doctrine I have heard
held at the Board.

*Have you heard the Guardians hold that they
were not to interfere with Persons not actually ill?*

I have.

*Has not the Doctor Power to object to the Dietary
as likely to produce Sickness?*

I do not know whether the Question refers to
legal or moral Power. I conceive he had not
Power to do any thing with respect to the Diet
of those who were well. The Diet fixed for the
House is under the Regulation of the Poor Law
Commission; and under the Ninety-eighth
Section, I think, any Man preventing its being
carried into effect is liable to Imprisonment.

897 *Is not that a Dietary selected by the Board
itself?*

Mr. John Bowen. It is selected out of Six
Dietaries sent down by the Commissioners.

*Do not the Board of Guardians exercise the Power
of altering the Dietary according to Circumstances in
their own Discretion?*

I cannot speak to the Power; your Lordships
will see that no such Power has been exercised
in this particular Case.

*Do you not know that in this particular Case the
Board of Guardians appointed a Committee to
examine Six Dietaries presented to them, and to
select one or such Portions of each as they preferred?*

I was not a Guardian at the Time, but I have
no Doubt of the Fact.

*You are of opinion that the Medical Officer has
not Power to appoint for those not sick any
Alteration of the Diet; was not he at liberty to report
upon the Diet if he did not approve of it, and suggest
another to the Commissioners for their Sanction?*

I suppose he might have reported.

*Do you not know that the Medical Man did report
that the Gruel particularly was injurious to the
Health of the Poor?*

I was not at the Time a Member of the Board
of Guardians; I do not know it of my own
Knowledge. I endeavoured, in drawing up this
Statement, to be able to refer your Lordships to
such particular Entries of Circumstances and
Persons as would give your Lordships
Information upon those Points.

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

9

The Entry you referred to is dated 23d of August; will you refer to the First Entry, mentioning the Paupers in the House being afflicted with the Diarrhæa?

Yes. The 30th of August it is stated, " Generally healthy "; 6th September, " Generally healthy "; the 13th of September, " Generally healthy ", the 20th of September, " Generally healthy. " The First Entry is the 27th of September; the Words are, " The aged Poor are afflicted with Colic and Diarrhæa, and the Children suffering from the same Complaint. " It appears, on an Inspection of the Medical Officer's Book, that there were One Case of Colic and Diarrhoea, Three of Colic without Diarrhæa, and Two of Diarrhæa without Colic; and on the 20th of September it appears that there were One infected with Diarrhæa and Fever, Five with Diarrhoea, and Two with Colic.

What is the Note in the Visitor's Book of the 20th of September?

" Generally healthy. "

(To Mr. Underdown.) *Is there a Book which will show the Sickness of the People in the Bridgwater Workhouse separate from those out of the Workhouse?*

There is not.

(To Mr. Bowen.) *Was Mr. Baker a Guardian at the Time the Diarrhæa first broke out?*

He was. Mr. Baker and the Medical Man had personal Knowledge of all those Facts, and the Governor of the Workhouse and the Matron had personal Knowledge of them.

Who was the Medical Officer at that Time?

Mr. Abraham King. He was taken ill about that Time, and Mr. Evered Poole attended for him.

When was it that the Surgeon of the Bridgwater District first wrote to the Board of Guardians respecting the Sickness in the House?

The Letter is dated Bridgwater, October, 25th. There is a correct Copy of that Letter in Page 74 of the printed Papers.

The following Entry is read from the Medical Book : 6 October 25th. There is much Sickness amongst the Children and the old People. There are Thirty-three Cases under the Care of the Medical Gentlemen. Ninety-six Inmates in the House. "

Do you know what Proceeding was taken by the Board in consequence of that Letter of the 25th of October?

I cannot tell of my own Knowledge; I have heard that there was no Proceeding taken upon it.

No; there are no Proceedings on the Face of the Book.

The Minutes of the Board of Guardians of the 25th of October are referred to, and there does not appear to be any Entry of the Receipt of a Letter from Mr. King, but that a Letter was read from Mr. John Evered Poole on the 1st of November, as follows :

" Gentlemen ,. " The Alterations recommended to the Board of Guardians last Week, respecting the Diet of the Sick at the Workhouse, has proved very advantageous, and they are now daily improving, and surrounded with every necessary Comfort; and the Governor has strictly attended to the Orders of the Medical Officer.

John EVERED POOLE. "

In this Pamphlet of yours you state, " It will scarcely be believed that, under such frightful Circumstances, all the Indulgence that could be obtained by the Representations of the Surgeon and some active Members of the Visiting Committee was confined to the Victims who were actually attacked. The Gruel was still to be used by others, although it had been distinctly stated that it produced Diarrhea, and that the Irritation of the Stomach and Bowels produced other distressing Effects. " Can you inform the Committee what the Order was for making the Alteration you refer to?

No. It is not on the Minute Book. And the Fact of Oatmeal having been regularly used at that Period, and after the Period of Mr. Poole's Letter, goes to the Fact that the Alteration was in respect of the Diet of the Sick, and not of those who were well.

Do you know what it was that the Medical Person recommended beyond what appears in the Letter of the 25th of October?

I do not on my own Knowledge; I know nothing but what appears upon this Paper.

Does he not in that Letter propose, " that the Children should return to Milk Diet; that proper Nurses should be in attendance Day and Night; that the sick should be separated from the healthy; and that the Sick Wards should not be scrubbed " ?

Yes. He does not propose to the Board to alter the Gruel Diet generally? No.

Do you know whether that Alteration was proposed in respect of the Inmates in general?

I do not of my own Knowledge; I was not a Member of the Board, and could not know it.

You know nothing of what was recommended beyond what appears in that Letter?

Just so.

And that Letter does not propose an Alteration with respect to the general Diet of the House?

No. I know nothing of it myself; but the

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

10

Medical Man told me he had been told that he had nothing to do with the Diet of Persons who were not on his List.

What Medical Man told you that?

Mr. Abraham King.

With respect to all those Cases where they were attacked with Colic and Diarrhæa, do you not suppose that after this Letter they returned to the Milk Diet, that proper Nurses were in attendance Day and Night, that the sick were separated from the healthy, and that the Sick Wards were not scrubbed?

I have no Doubt of that. If your Lordships will allow me to turn to the Visitors Book, I can state. In the last Report upon the Fact, the 25th of October, the Question is, "Is the established Dietary duly observed; and are the Hours of Meals regularly adhered to?"

899 It has been departed from this Week by the Direction of the Medical Officer. In consequence of Sickness amongst the Children and weak People Milk has been used instead of Gruel." The next Entry is November the 1st: "Is the established Dietary duly observed; and are the Hours of Meals regularly adhered to?—Yes, with respect to the healthy Inmates; but for the sick, Milk, Rice, and Arrow Root have been substituted for Gruel by Order of the Medical Officer."

Who signed that?

They were both signed by the same Man, Mr. William Baker.

Does it not appear that all that was recommended by the Medical Persons was attended to by the Board of Guardians upon that Occasion?

All which appears upon that Letter to be recommended.

When did the Board of Guardians order the abolishing of the Gruel Diet?

Not for Six Months. The next Entry is, "Yes, as regards the healthy Inmates; but for the sick, Rice, Milk, and Arrow Root have been substituted in lieu of Gruel."

You do not know how far the Medical Persons ever stated to the Board that the Dietary adopted in the Workhouse produced the Illness in the House?

I could not know that of my own Knowledge; I was not a Member of the Board.

Does not it appear from those Entries that that recommended by the Medical Officers has been attended to by the Board?

But this Medical Person told me that he had repeatedly made Applications to the Board which were not attended to.

What was the next Change which took place in the Dietary?

I will read the Entries, which will put your Lordships into possession of the Thing Week after Week. 8th of November: "Yes, as regards the

healthy Inmates; but for the sick, Milk, Rice, and Arrow Root have been substituted for Gruel by Order of the Medical Officer." November the 15th: 6. Yes, as regards the healthy Inmates; but for the sick, Milk, Rice, and Arrow Root have been substituted in lieu of Gruel."

What is the Answer as to the Health of the Inmates on that Day?

"The Health of the Inmates of the House rapidly improving." November the 15th: "The Health of the Inmates generally good, with the Exception of Five Children." November 22d: "The Health of the Inmates still improving." In reply to the Question respecting the Diet: "Yes, with respect to the healthy Inmates; for the sick, generally Milk, Rice, and Arrow Root; and Meat for the Children who are recovering from the Measles; by Order of the Medical Officer." Then on the 29th of November the Answer to the Second Question is, "Still much Sickness in the House." The Answer to the Tenth Question is, "The Dietary is the same as it has been since October 25th." The next Week: "The Health of the Inmates is improving. The Dietary the same as it has been." The 13th of December: "Much Sickness is still prevalent in the House. The Dietary the same as it has been." The 20th of December: "The Health of the Inmates is improving. The Dietary is the same as was established 25th October last." The 27th of December: "The Health of the Inmates is improving. The Dietary is the same as established 25th October last." The 3d of January: "The Inmates of the House are again unhealthy, particularly the Children who have had the Measles,"

That went on so till the 14th of April?

Yes, it did.

Will you refer to the Visiting Book for the Entry of the 24th of March.

The Entry is, "Still continuing to improve." April the 7th: "The Health of the Inmates continues to improve, and there is no particular Sickness prevalent." On the 14th: "There is still Diarrhoea, and a Disposition to increase; and the Medical Officer recommends Rice and Milk as a Substitute for Bread and Cheese Dinners on Two of the Days."

900 *Who signed that?*

The Rev. Noblett Ruddock.

Who signed the Entry on the 7th of April?

The same Gentleman.

Was that proposed Alteration made of the Milk and Rice instead of Bread and Cheese?

No; it was not then made.

The Medical Officer did not upon that Occasion wish the Gruel to be discontinued; was the Milk and Rice substituted for the Cheese?

He did wish the Gruel to be discontinued. Mr. Ruddock made the Entry; and having only a small Space to write on, he entered the proposed Alteration for Bread and Cheese without entering the Recommendation to

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

11

abolish the Gruel.

How do you know that?

Because his subsequent Entry will show that.
I was at the Time at the Board.

Where will that be found?

This Pamphlet which I have published details what took place, as nearly as can be stated. The First Meeting of the new Board of Guardians was held on the 31st of March 1837.

That was previous to the 14th of April?

Yes. " Having been appointed a Member of the Visiting Committee, and informed myself by personal Inspection on the State of the Poor then in the Bridgwater Workhouse, I went carefully through the Obituary, the Visitor's Book, the Medical Weekly Return, and such other Documents as would fairly bring under my View the past and present Condition of the Inmates of the Workhouse. At this Time the general Appearance of the Poor in the House was haggard and emaciated beyond Description. On the 14th of April there were Twelve Cases of Diarrhea on the Medical Weekly Return; several of the wretched Sufferers had been seized in the course of the Week. " That was in the Bridgwater Union. " Under these alarming Circumstances the Visiting Committee requested the Medical Officer to attend them at the Workhouse, when that Gentleman again strongly urged the Necessity of making an Alteration in the Diet. He proposed that Gruel should be no longer administered, but that instead of it Milk should be used for Breakfast, and that Rice and Milk should be substituted for Bread and Cheese Dinners on Two Days in the Week. "

You were present when that was done?

I was present, and had previously in the course of the Week gone through the House Two or Three Times. I do not mean to accuse the Gentlemen who have signed the Reports from Time to Time of any intentional Misrepresentation; but it appears from them that the People were a good deal better one Week and a great deal worse another, in a Manner not to be comprehended.

Who signed that Recommendation, " that Gruel should be no longer administered, but that instead of it Milk should be used for Breakfast, and that Rice and Milk should be substituted for Bread and Cheese"?

Mr. Ruddock.

Mr. Ruddock had not entered the Recommendation correctly?

No. I will state from this Document what took place on that Occasion "Under these alarming Circumstances the Visiting Committee requested the Medical Officer to attend them at the Workhouse, when that Gentleman again strongly urged the Necessity of making an Alteration in the Diet. He proposed that Gruel

should be no longer administered, but that instead of Milk should be used for Breakfast, and that Rice and Milk should be substituted for Bread-and-Cheese Dinners on Two Days in the Week. The Visiting Committee unanimously agreed to recommend the Suggestions of the Medical Attendant to the Board of Guardians; and a Reverend Member of the Colledge, who was the appointed Visitor for the Week, made the following Entry in the Visitor's Book. " That does not go to the Extent of the Recommendation.

901 *Where does it appear that any Recommendation was made by the Medical Mr. Officer that the Gruel should be discontinued; so far as the Entry in the Book goes, it is only that Rice and Milk should be substituted for the Bread-and Cheese Dinners?*

I do not conceive it is to be found on Record. Mr. Ruddock, the Visitor of the Day, made his Entry in his own Way.

The Visiting Committee having received that Communication from the Medical Officer a Motion was made in the Board?

The Proceeding was as follows : " The Members of the Visiting Committee proceeded to the Board of Guardians to support the Recommendation of the Medical Officer. The Reverend Gentleman who was the Visitor for the Week was considered the most proper Person to state the reiterated Opinion of the Surgeon, " who had declared he had very frequently recommended the same Course, " and the distressing Condition of the Inmates, to the Board. This he did with the Temper and Earnestness of a Christian Pastor urging his Brother Men to the Performance of a solemn Duty, The Recommendation of the Surgeon was strongly and feelingly advocated, and the Fact stated, that the old People who were allowed Tea had suffered less from Diarrhea than the other Inmates. " All this is in proof that the Medical Man attended; that Mr. Ruddock applied to do away with the Gruel; that the Argument was adduced that the old People who had not Gruel were less affected than those who had. " Another. Member of the Visiting Committee with Documents in his Hands to which he referred in proof of his Assertions, urged on the Board the appalling Fact that Thirty Persons had died in the Workhouse in Nine Months out of an Average of Ninety-four Inmates.

Was that the Fact, to your Knowledge, that Thirty Persons had died in Nine Months?

I know they were entered in the Obituary as having died; and perhaps it will simplify the Thing if I say, that the Guardian who took those Documents to the Board, and urged them upon the Board, was myself. As a Member of the Visiting Committee I went on to show " that in the same House, on the old Dietary, only Nine Persons had died in the Parochial Year ending March 1836, and the

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

12

same Number in the previous Year, out of an Average of more than Sixty-six Residents. " The Average was higher than that; it was, I think, Seventy-two. " He further insisted on the strong Probability afforded by the rapid Progress of the Disease during the previous Fortnight, that it would soon acquire all its former Virulence. "

What do you mean by " its former Virulence " ?

It had been much worse; but while this Fluctuation was going on there were Thirty Persons had died without any Notice having been taken of it in the Visiting Book but such as have been read.

Still you have not shown any Recommendation of the Surgeon that the Gruel should be discontinued; you have shown that Mr. Ruddock recom mended the Substitution of Rice and Milk for Bread and Cheese, and that Mr. Ruddock did in addition propose to substitute Milk for Breakfast in lieu of Gruel, but that that was not done in consequence of any Request made by the Medical Officer?

That is a part of the Evidence. It proceeds thus : " Under these alarming Circumstances the Visiting Committee requested the Medical Officer to attend them at the Workhouse, when that Gentleman again strongly urged the Necessity of making an Alteration in the Diet. He proposed that Gruel should be no longer administered. "

Do you know that he had urged that before?

He said he had repeatedly.

Did you hear the Medical Officer state to the Visiting Committee that the Gruel ought to be discontinued and Milk substituted?

Most certainly.

Did he also order Rice and Milk as a Substitute for Bread and Cheese?

He also recommended that.

902 *Did the Board agree to his Proposition?*

Certainly not that Week.

What Week was that?

On the 14th of April.

Is there any Entry upon that Subject?

I cannot speak from Memory; I think there was not any Entry; I think the Course taken by the Chairman prevented any Entry.

What was that Course?

The Chairman was Mr. Warry; and what I have written is this : " So far were these Statements from effecting any Amelioration in the Condition of the unfortunate Inmates of the Workhouse, that the Recommendation of the Surgeon was not even put to the Meeting, or any Communication made to him on the Subject. The Matter was not only passed by, as being altogether unworthy of Notice, but it was said that the Medical Man had gone out of his Course in making such a Recommendation; that although it was competent for him to prescribe Diet for the sick he could not be permitted to

make Experiments on the Diet of those who were not actually on his List; that the Dietary was an important part of the Regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners, and that the Board might as well talk of altering the Poor Law altogether as of making any Alteration in the Dietary. "

Are you sure that he said this?

I am as certain of it as of any thing I ever knew in my Life.

Upon your Oath you state that you were present, and he said this?

Yes, and I must beg to say that as there can be no Doubt of Mr. Ruddock's Entry there can be no Doubt also of the Visiting Committee making this Representation to the Board; and as there is not the slightest Notice taken in the Minute Book of such a Resolution being proposed, or its being noticed as Matter of Business in any Way, I presume that is Evidence that the Board of Guardians refused to interfere.

Was there a Resolution moved upon the Subject?

Mr. Ruddock stood up and made some Observations upon the Subject, when Mr. Warry said that such a Resolution could not be put from the Chair.

Was there a Resolution, regularly moved and seconded, put into the Hands of the Chairman?

No; there was no Resolution drawn up. The Chairman said that they sat there to administer the Poor Law Act, and that the Dietary was an important Part of the System.

How came you with your Feelings not to propose a Resolution?

Whether right or wrong, I have already stated that I took my Seat with a Determination not to propose any Resolution.

Did you take down the Words of the Chairman at the Time, or subsequently?

I took them down while they were fresh in my Recollection; I made a Memorandum at the same Time, and on going Home I wrote them out within an Hour.

Mr. Ruddock and the other Gentlemen on the Visiting Committee were not bound by what you conceived prevented your moving a Resolution; May did not they propose a Resolution to that Effect?

I cannot answer for their Reason. If I had been in their Situation I shown have moved such a Resolution if I had stood alone.

In point of fact no such Resolution was moved and seconded?

There was no Resolution submitted to the Vote. The Visitor for the Day Mr. Ruddock, got up and told his own Story very moderately; and then I followed him, and took the Death Book in my Hand and the old Book containing the

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

13

Number of Deaths in the old Workhouse, and contrasted it w those in the present, and called the Attention of the Board to the Subject.

Was it after that that Mr. Warry the Chairman said what you have stated?

Yes : " that the Medical Man had gone out of his Course in making such Recommendation; that although **903** it was competent for him to prescribe Diet for the sick he could not be permitted to make Experiments on the Diet of those who were not actually on his List. "

Did that, in your Opinion, discourage the Guardians who were disposed to make a Motion from making one?

Certainly; there appeared to be a strong Feeling, but the Matter was stopped for that Day.

Was there much Discussion about it on that Day?

No; not much Discussion.

Did not any of those Gentlemen who thought it important the Alteration should be made urge it?

It was impossible for them to urge it more strongly than they did. Mr. Warry is a Barrister, and was referred to by the Farmers as the Law Oracle upon the Occasion. If any Country Gentleman had been in the Chair who would : have carried the Law into execution, without pretending to be extremely well versed in the Technicalities of it, I have no Doubt such a Resolution would have by been put and carried.

The Resolution was not moved?

No; but it was mentioned.

Looking back to that Transaction, are you of opinion that the Visiting Committee, having this Impression upon their Minds with respect to the Necessity of altering the Diet, did their Duty in not proposing that Alteration to the Board?

In speaking of the Visiting Committee of Gentlemen, with some of whom I have passed a large Portion of my Life, and for whom I have great Respect, I must say that I think they did not act with that Firmness and Resolution which they ought to have done. And I will state, if your Lordships please, how I expressed my own Opinions upon the Subject.

On the 21st of April you attended-the next Board?

I attended the Workhouse Two or Three Times in the course of the Week; or and the State of it was such as I cannot describe, more offensive than can be conceived.

It was such as you have represented in your Pamphlet?

Yes. There are on your Lordships Table Returns of the Cases of Diarrhæa and Bowel Affection in the House and out of the House. If

your Lordships will refer to Pages 3, 4, and 5 of the Return before the Committee, the Facts will appear that out of the House the cases of Diarrhæa amounted only to Two among Fifty-nine who were on the Sick List; thus there were only Two poor Persons under the Care of the Surgeon affected with Diarrhæa among 649 Out-paupers. In the House there were Ninety-six Persons, and Twenty of them were affected with Diarrhoea and Bowel Complaint in a most violent Degree. I inquired of the Medical Man what he meant by Bowel Complaint, and he said they were compound Cases, where the Bowels were in a State of Ulceration.

On the 21st of April you say you attended the Board, and that, having visited the House in the meantime, Two or Three Times, you took upon you to represent the State of the Workhouse to the Board again?

Yes.

Were the Wards inspected by anybody else in the meantime?

Not to my Knowledge.

You say in your Pamphlet, " The Wards were however inspected by another Person, and the distressing Condition of the Inmates reported to the Committee by the Visitor; " who is that Person?

Myself.

You reported their State to the Visiting Committee?

Yes; on the 21st.

You did not report any thing between the 14th and the 21st?

I had no opportunity.

904 *Did you urge them upon that Occasion to make some more urgent Repräsentation to the Board upon the Subject?*

I did. I have the Statement here that I wrote out at the Time.

You reported this to the Committee, and urged them to make a more importunate Representation to the Board?

Yes. On my going to the House on the 21st of April I found one of the Visiting Committee there who declined going round the House.

Who was that?

Mr. William Pitman King.

Why did he decline going round the House?

From the dreadful Condition of the House. He said he would not go round the House for 50l.

From its being contagious?

Yes; and its being more dreadfully offensive than can be conceived,

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

14

Did they agree to make another Representation to the Board of Guardians?

They did, on my declaring that I would instantly withdraw from the Committee if they did not, as I should consider my continuing longer in it under those Circumstances would be becoming necessary to Murder.

Did the Surgeon attend the Board of Guardians by Direction of the Committee?

He did.

Was there any Resolution passed upon that Occasion, or Motion made?

It is very important to understand what took place upon that Occasion. The Visitor of the Day made his Representation on the State of the House, and the Medical Attendant was directed to attend. He stated that the Paupers above Sixty who were allowed Tea and Sugar did not suffer from Diarrhoea as much as those who were dieted on Gruel, and therefore he felt justified in recommending on his own Experience that the Gruel should be discontinued and Rice and Milk substituted. The Chairman, Mr. Warry, was not present on that Day, and the Vice Chairman acted.

Who is he?

The Reverend Samuel Starkie. He said that the better Way was to consider the whole of the Persons in the House ill; all the Inmates in such a State as would justify the Board acting upon the Recommendation of the Surgeon treating the whole of them as sick.

By way of Precaution?

Yes; not to break in upon what he conceived to be the Letter of the Act, which was a reasonable Course of proceeding, and was adopted.

Therefore there was no Resolution moved, inasmuch as the Board of Guardians were willing to do what the Medical Officer desired?

Yes; the Board of Guardians acted on that; considered it a Mode of evading the Regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners.

That was the first Case in which there was an Order for a Change of Diet made?

Yes. In consequence of that Recommendation an Entry was made, which I will read : " On reading the Minutes on the Bridgwater Visitors Book it appeared that Diarrhæa still prevailed in the House, and that the Inmates were not generally healthy. It was thereupon moved by Mr. William Pitman King, and seconded by the Reverend Noblett Ruddock, that the Medical Officer be requested to attend the Board for the Purpose of giving Information as to the State of the Health of the Paupers relative to the Minute above stated. Mr. Abraham King, Medical Officer, was thereupon sent for,

who soon after attended the Board, and confirmed the Report of the Visiting Committee, and stated that the Paupers above Sixty who were allowed Tea and Sugar did not suffer from Diarrhea as much as those who were dieted on Gruel, and recommended that for the present Rice be substituted for Gruel, which the Board agreed to.

Was there any reference to the Poor Law Commissioners on that Subject?

No, not then; there was some Time after that

Do you know what was the Effect of that Change of Diet?

I attended the House frequently during the Week, and found a greater Improvement in the
905 Health of the People than I could have supposed possible.

Was a Change made with respect to the Bread and Cheese?

For Bread and Cheese at Dinner Rice and Milk were substituted for Two Days in the Week, and the Gruel was entirely done away.

Did the Diarrhæa cease?

April the 26th, the next Week, in answer to the Question, " Is the Establishment Dietary duly observed? " the Answer is, " Milk has been substituted in lieu of Gruel for Breakfast, and Rice for Bread and Cheese for Dinner Two Days in the Week, by Order of the Medical Officer. " " Are the Inmates generally healthy? - The Inmates are not generally healthy, but there is a great Improvement since the last Report, occasioned by the Change of Diet; Diarrhea has decreased from Eighteen to Three Cases since the last Report. "

Who has signed that?

That is signed by the Visitor of the Day, William Pitman King, the Gentle man who declined to go round the House.

Was that Dietary afterwards changed back again to Gruel?

No; Gruel has never been introduced since.

Have the Poor since been tolerably healthy so far as you have understood?

Diarrhæa has not prevailed since, but there have been other Diseases which may require your Lordships Notice.

Did you ever press upon the Board of Guardians, when Mr. Warry stated that they might as well make any other Alteration in the Law as meddle with the Dietary, to refer to the Board of Commissioners in London to see how far under the Circumstances they should not be allowed to alter the Dietary?

I did nothing more than I have before stated. I took the Labour of the Thing; I brought before the Board the Deaths from the first Establishment of the Union, and the Deaths under the old System for several Years. I stated that I could not conceive there could be any

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

15

Reason for more Deaths among the Inmates of the Workhouse under the new System than under the old, unless such as were connected with the Diet or with the internal Management.

You say no Resolutions were put with respect to the Diet; that such was prevented by Mr. Warry's stating that they were not competent to alter the Dietary; did you ever press upon him the Necessity of an Application to the Poor Law Commissioners, to see whether they would not allow an Alteration, if the Board did not feel themselves competent to make it?

I did not do that; I did not go beyond what I have stated. The Business closed with Mr. Warry's Declaration. I was determined never to attend the Committee but once more, unless I could effect an Alteration; and, as has been shown, the next Week it was effected.

You say more died under the new System than under the old; were not the Months of January, February, and March 1837 a Period of very universal Sickness in that Neighbourhood as well as others?

There was a good deal of Influenza at that Season of the Year, and perhaps the Season was unusually unhealthy, but Diarrhæa was not a prevalent Complaint. The Number of Deaths out of the Workhouse that Year was not greater than the average Number for the last Three Years, 1834, 1835, and 1836.

You say that the Number of Deaths in 1837 was not greater than the average Number of Deaths in the preceding Years, 1834, 1835, and 1836; can you tell whether the Deaths in the Months of January, February, and March of 1837 were not more than the average Number of Deaths in those Months the preceding Year?

I cannot. I have a Paper before me, and I ought not to venture Information without reference to it. I beg to say, in putting these Figures before the Committee, I have never looked out for One Figure or One Month that would suit my own View of the Case. The Paper does not contain the particular Months, but I can state that which will be more satisfactory. I have an Extract from the Parish Register of Bridgwater showing the Number of Burials in the Parish of Bridgwater for some Years. In the Year 1833 there were 179 Persons died; in 1834 906 there were 144 died; in 1835, 113; in 1836, 172; in 1837, 181. The Number of Burials from the 1st of October 1833 to the 30th of April 1834 was 132; from the 1st of October 1834 to the 30th of April 1835, Seventy-four; from the 1st of October 1835 to the 30th of April 1836, Seventy-two; from the 1st of October 1836 to the 30th of April 1837, 116. The Numbers for the Three first Years amount to 278; deducting the Deaths in the Workhouse in these Three Years, which

were Seventeen, there are left 261. The Average each Year would be Eighty-seven. Then deducting the Deaths in the Workhouse the last Year, which were Twenty-seven, from the Number in the whole Parish, which was 116, leaves Eighty-nine; being only Two Deaths more than the Average of the preceding Three Years.

Can you state whether the Number of Deaths for the Months of January, February, and March 1837 was greater than the average Number of Deaths for the corresponding Months in the preceding Years?

I cannot answer that; I did not feel myself justified in picking out those particular Months; I took the Period throughout which the Ravages of the Diarrhæa extended, from the 1st of October to the 30th of April.

You state that the Number of Deaths was greater than those in the old Workhouse, having been Nine on Seventy Persons, and that lately there had been Thirty-nine on the Average of Ninety-four?

That is so.

Is it fair to take the average Number of Inmates in the Workhouse, and not the whole Number of Persons from whom the Deaths are to occur?

If you could get at the whole Number in both Cases it would be fair to take them; but I cannot get the whole Number of Persons that were in the Workhouse for the whole Period in either Case.

Have you drawn any Inference at all from the Average?

Certainly.

Supposing there was no great Change of the Inmates in the old Workhouse, but the Average was Seventy, would not there be a much smaller Number than if there had been a frequent Change, the Average continuing the same?

It might be so to a small Extent.

You say there were Nine died on an Average, and Thirty under the new System; supposing Five had died every Week in the Twelvemonth, and Five had come in every Week during the Twelvemonth, the Average would have been the same, would it not?

No, I conceive not.

Supposing Five had died and Five had come in every Week, would not the Average have been precisely the same?

Certainly it would.

Then if Five had died every Week, would there not have died 260 in the course of the Year?

Yes.

Then when you made that Statement with respect to the Deaths, as compared with the Number of Persons who had died, would you say that 260 Persons had died out of Ninety?

No, certainly not.

Does not it appear that it is unfair to compare the Number of Deaths with the average Number of Persons in the Workhouse?

I think not. I stated that in the one Case there were Nine Persons died on an Average of Seventy Persons, and on the other there were Thirty died on an Average of Ninety; if the whole Number in both Cases were to be reckoned on, that becomes a Matter of Figures, and may be taken out.

Is it not necessary that the whole Number of Persons from whom those Per. sons died should be taken to ascertain at all what was the Proportion of Deaths?

No, unless you want to ascertain it to a Fraction.

907 *Suppose in the one Case the Change was less, that under the old System the. Average was Seventy, and they had been precisely the same Persons without changing, and that under the new System the Change was considerable, some going out and some coming in; would that afford any Ground of Comparison?*

Not without taking all the Elements into consideration.

Does it form any Ground whatever?

Certainly it does, in my Opinion.

In your Pamphlet, at Page 37, it is stated that in Bridgwater Workhouse the average Number of Inmates was Ninety-four, being $41 \frac{4}{10}$ per Cent.; do you mean to state by that, that $41 \frac{4}{10}$ died out of every 100 Persons?

No; but that Thirty-nine died out of an Average of Ninety-four, which would have been at the Rate of $41 \frac{4}{10}$ if there had been 100 Persons in the House.

Did you not know that there were more than 100 Persons in the House during the Time those Thirty Persons died?

Yes; there had been more than 100 Persons in the House in the course of the Year. I cannot run through these Figures without having a little Time. I compare the Deaths in the Bridgwater Workhouse with the average Number of Inmates; and I compare the Deaths of Prisoners in the Hulks on a fair Average of the Persons there as given by the Superintendent; and the same as to Hospitals, Depôts, and so on; the Averages are taken in all Cases. I have no Means of ascertaining how many Persons pass through in a certain Number of Days.

The Question is not as to the Fairness or Unfairness of the Comparison as to Hospitals, Depôts, and so forth, but with respect to the Bridgwater Workhouse; you have taken the total

Number of Deaths and the average Number of Inmates?

Yes.

Is that a perfectly fair Mode of meeting the Question?

Perfectly. I have stated it to be the average Number of Inmates; if it were not to be so taken it would be a Fraud.

You do not mean to be understood that $41 \frac{4}{10}$ died out of every 100 who had been in the House?

No.

Do you know that from the Manner in which it has been stated, it has been so understood?

No; I should have thought it could not be; there is a distinct Statement that Thirty-nine had died.

That is $41 \frac{4}{10}$ per Cent., if the total Number of Persons out of which those Deaths occurred had amounted to more than 100?

Yes.

Then is that a fair Ground of Comparison?

I conceive it is.

Should you not have taken the total Number of Deaths, and the total Number of Persons who had passed through the House?

I might have made a Dozen other Calculations in different Forms; but that which I have given is what it professes to be on the Average.

Does it give any Means of judging of the Case at all?

I conceive it does.

Supposing that Five Persons had died every Week, and still that the Average Number of Persons had continued the same, how would you have stated the Proposition?

I cannot put a supposititious Case against those Facts. Suppose Five Persons had died every Week in the Workhouse, the Average continuing the same, how would you have made that Statement in the Form in which you have made this Statement?

I should not have made it in that Form.

908 *Then how could you have compared the Deaths with the Number of Persons?*

I could not have done it in that Form, certainly.

Does not that prove that it is an unfair Way of meeting the Case, to take the total Number of Deaths with the average Number of Persons?

No; not if I state that it is the average Number of Persons.

Can any Man draw an Inference from the Circumstance of taking the average Number of Persons and the total Number of Deaths?

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

17

I conceive so; the one for the Deaths on the old System was taken from the declared average Number of Inmates.

That is drawing a Comparison between the old System and the new; but is that Comparison fair, supposing that in the old System, where in the average Number of Seventy Persons in the Workhouse Nine died, those Seventy remained the same all the Year round; while in the other Case, not only the Persons who died were replaced, but there were continually fresh Persons coming in, though the Average continued the same; would not the one be the Case of Nine Persons dying out of Seventy, while in the other it was Thirty dying out of 190 or 200?

Presuming the Facts to be as your Lordship has stated them, that would be the Result.

But you have stated the Facts as they appear to you; from the Average, not the actual Number?

Yes.

Have you ascertained how many Deaths there were from the Beginning of the Diarrhea to the End of it in the Workhouse?

There are only Ten Cases entered as dying directly of Diarrhæa, but there are a Number of Cases entered as having died of Measles and other Disorders where they were Persons previously afflicted with Diarrhæa.

Do you know that from your own Knowledge?

I collected it from the Medical Attendant, the Matron and the Governor of the Workhouse; but I would likewise observe that other Persons not in that List died of Diarrhæa whose Deaths are ascribed to other Causes.

How do you know that?

There are Three Persons, whose Cases I will read : James Pocock, Mary Tucker, and Henry Perry. They are entered as having died of Debility, old Age. Now I knew, when I saw this Entry, those Persons had been labouring under very severe Diarrhæa, and I called at the Workhouse to inquire what was their State previous to their Death. The Matron's Account was to the following Effect, and fully borne out by others; I took this at the Time from the Matron : " Mr. Ward said, for some Time, that there was no such Thing as Diarrhæa in the House; then he said they were all Cases of Diarrhea returned, and that he would send me some astringent Powders, of which I was to give Two or Three a Day, as Occasion required; I did do so, until Mr. Ward told me not to give any more, as the Powders had lost their Effect, and that he would send some thing else. After that he sent some Draughts, which I gave occasionally. "

Have you not stated somewhere that Fifty odd died in the Workhouse of Diarrhæa?

Not of Diarrhoea; but that Fifty-four Persons had died in the Workhouse.

In how long a Time?

There are Fifty Deaths between the 15th July and the 22nd June, and I believe up to July there were Four more.

You do not know of what Diseases those Persons died?

The Books will show that.

Those Persons all died in the Workhouse?

Those Persons died in the Two Workhouses, Petherton and Bridgwater Workhouses.

There is an Entry of the Number of Deaths which took place during that Time of Fifty; supposing the Average in the Workhouse at that Time was upwards of Ninety, should you say that was more than Fifty per Cent.?

More than Fifty per Cent. upon the Average.

909 *Suppose the total Number of Persons admitted into the Workhouse to be 385, would it not be incorrect to state the Proportion per Cent. of that Number of Fifty upon the 385?*

No, it would not; for this Reason, that Persons might have passed through the Workhouse, out of those 385, who were not long resident there, and who, though they increased the Number of Persons, would not increase the Number of Deaths in an equal Proportion.

If a Person had passed through the Workhouse only Two Days, and had died during those Two Days, should not you have included him in the Number of Deaths?

Yes.

Then you take it one way and not another?

I mean that it would not be fair so to take it.

Is it not the Fact, that you take it on the Number of Deaths?

I put certain Statements before your Lordships; I do not profess to have made them up in a Way which they are not made up in; it is for your Lordships to make Allowances for the Length of Time those Persons had been in the House.

Do you not infer the Existence of the Fact, from the Statement in your Pamphlet, Page 28, that 41⁴/₁₀ died out of every 100?

I state that Thirty-nine Persons died absolutely, which was at the Rate of 41⁴/₁₀ on the average Number of Inmates; those are the Words; there is not the smallest Attempt at Deception in them.

You do not mean that it should be understood that 41⁴/₁₀ died out of every 100?

Not of every 100 admitted, but out of the average Number of Inmates.

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

18

You will feel great Regret when you find, from the Pamphlet of another Gentleman, that it has been so understood. " I have seen Mr. Bowen's Statement of the Result of the Union of Bridgwater, where he himself is a Guardian; by that it appears that Forty-one out of every 100 perished per Annum; the greater Proportion of them Children, " throwing those in one Scale?

I cannot answer for other Men's Blunders.

Do you not regret that what you have written should be so understood?

No; not more than I regret other Misunderstandings. If I can fix your Lordships Attention on the enormous Number who did, die it is of very little Importance that I should be misunderstood by that Gentleman. I had rather not be misunderstood, certainly..

Can your Statement fix in a Person's Mind the Proportion of the Persons who did die?

It does that which it professes to do; it gives the Average of the Number of Inmates.

You have said that you could not make a Comparison, supposing Five had died in every Week?

The Supposition is so monstrous I cannot enter into it. I do not mean to use the Expression with the smallest Degree of Reflection on the Use of it; but in ordinary Cases such a Thing could never occur.

Suppose it did occur, how would you draw the Comparison between the Number in the House and the Number of Deaths which occurred?

I do not know. I have stated the Facts, and I believe I have stated them correctly. If it can be shown that I have stated them incorrectly, I shall be happy to avail myself of every Means, through the public Press or otherwise, of setting myself right.

Will you take the pains to rectify the Mistake made by the Gentleman whose Pamphlet has been referred to, founded upon your Statement?

I respectfully submit it would not be fair for this Committee to attempt to tie me down as to the Statements I shall make, or the Course I shall take. With respect to the Statement before your Lordships, I pledge myself that if I have made any Mistake I will avail myself of every Means of setting myself right.

910 *ave you not discovered that you have so stated the Facts as to create a Mistake?*

I think that I have stated the Facts much below the Mark, and that if they were all brought out they would enable me to go much further than I have done.

You conceive, speaking upon your Oath, that you have understated the Facts which have come within your Knowledge?

Upon my Oath I believe I have understated every Fact.

Do you conceive that the Facts fully justify the Conclusions you have drawn?

I do.

With respect to the Persons who were admitted into the Workhouse; at the Time those Persons were admitted were they in a better or worse State of Health than they were afterwards?

It is probable that there were few Persons admitted into the Workhouse in such a District as Bridgwater Union who were not in a certain Degree impaired in Health.

Did a considerable Portion of those among whom the Deaths occurred consist of Children and young Persons?

Yes, certainly.

Was there a larger Proportion in the one Workhouse than in the other?

I should conceive about the same Proportion. I am not prepared to state that there was any Difference.

Many less died in the old Workhouse than in the new?

In the Proportion I have stated.

You have instituted a Comparison between those who died in the Workhouse and those who died in different Hospitals; how do you find from that Comparison which is the greatest Number of Deaths?

The Number of Deaths in the Workhouse is so vastly out of Proportion to that other Return.

Will you mention how many of those Cases?

In the Return of the General Military Hospital, Fort Pitt, Invalid Depôt, there were 20, 720 Persons treated as Patients. Among those were 890 Deaths; the Rate per Cent. appears $\frac{4^3}{10}$.

You say they were treated as Patients?

I cannot go out of that Book and enter into Particulars.

Do you know that they were so treated?

I take for granted that there is no Person sent to a Hospital but those that are sick..

Do you know that those are the whole Number of Persons sent to the Hospital?

I take for granted that it is so. I take those Returns as I find them.

Then why did not you take the whole Number during the Period passing through the Workhouse, and strike the Average?

I think that might have been a better Mode of doing the Thing.

You refer to the Deaths of Three old Persons, which you say are not entered; who was in fault there, the Master or the Surgeon?

Day 10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen, p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

19

I only produce those Instances to show that there is no Confidence to be placed in that Book.

You think beyond those Ten Cases of Diarrhæa there were Three more that ought to have been classed under Deaths by Diarrhæa?

I think there were upwards of Twenty more. In the List in which the Ten Cases are there are a certain Number of other Cases which I refer to Diarrhæa. Those Three Persons in this List I conceive ought clearly to be included in the Report; and I have stated that this List, awful as it is, does not include the Whole.

911 *What Number of Deaths does that List include?*

It includes, I think, Twenty-seven Persons.

In how long a Time?

It appears by the Obituary that those Persons died between September 1836 and May 1837.

During the Time you were attending the House as Guardian was it believed by the Medical Men and by yourself that the Disorder was infectious?

It had been considered for some Time infectious.

During that Time that it was considered infectious were there any fresh Persons put into that Workhouse?

Regularly.

Do you happen to know of your own Knowledge whether any of them died?

No, I do not, indeed.

Were there more brought in?

Yes.

Were they mixed together, living in the same Rooms with the infected Persons?

The Bridgwater Workhouse is an old ill-formed Workhouse; there were no effective Means to separate them, but Attempts were made to separate them as well as it could be accomplished.

In fact, they lived together?

Yes.

You do not know of your own Knowledge whether any Person sent into the Workhouse in this Way died of Diarrhea?

I do not know of my own Knowledge.

Have you heard it from the Report of the Officers in the Union?

Yes; it is so understood.

Was it said by the Officers of the Union that some of the Persons newly brought in after it was well known there was an infectious Disorder prevailing there died?

There is no Doubt of the Fact; but the Officer attending the House can prove that; I am not in a Position to prove it; the Matron and Governor can attest it.

Was it ever reported to the Board of Guardians that the Disorder was infectious?

It was a Matter of common Notoriety, as common as the Coronation of the Queen last week. I do not suppose any Person would report it; the Guardians would not venture themselves in the House.

They would not venture themselves in the House, but they continued to send others?

They regularly sent others.

Did you make a Representation to the Board of their sending in fresh Poor after it was considered that the Disorder was infectious?

I came into Office on the 31st of March; on the 14th of April an Attempt to do away with the System was made, and on the 21st it succeeded; in the short Space of Three Weeks therefore after I came into Office it was changed.

Did any One Guardian make any Representation to the Board that they should not admit fresh Persons into the House on account of Infection?

There is a Letter on the Subject by an excellent Man who did all he could to carry the Poor Law into execution. I desired him to put on Paper what he did at that Time, and he says, " he House was considered infectious for a long Time, and I believe none of the Guardians visited the Sick Wards for Two or Three Months. The Medical Officer assured me that he had several Times caught the Diarrhæa in the Performance of his Duty there. He advised me not to go in the Bed Rooms, and also advised the Governor and Matron to go into them as seldom as possible. 'Still, with **912** every Precaution, the Governor's Children were attacked with Diarrhæa, and he himself was so far reduced by repeated Attacks that he was allowed Leave of Absence to go from Bridgwater for some Time for the Purpose of changing the Air. Repeated Attempts were made to hire Nurses and Workwomen, without Success; and I have no Doubt that the dangerous State of the House deterred Persons from undertaking those Employments. The Number of Deaths which occurred, and the generally unhealthy State of the Inmates, were so alarming, that I was induced to apply to the Clerk of the Board for Information on the usual Mortality of the House during the many Years that he had the Care of it as Assistant Overseer. This Information I obtained, and took it to the Board, and with the Death Book in my Hand contrasted the few Deaths under the old System with the awful Number recorded in the Obituary of the Board. I implored the Guardians not to send any more Paupers into the House while so dangerous a Disease prevailed there; but to no Purpose. The Reply given was, that the Law must be carried into effect as far as possible; and that the House would hold still more according to the Report made of it

Evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee enquiry on the Operation of the
Poor Law Amendment Act .

Day10, 6 July 1838

Evidence of Robert Weale, p 887; John Bowen,p 889

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

20

when taken for the Union. I was so strongly impressed with the Danger of receiving fresh Inmates that I prevailed on some who were ordered in the Workhouse to keep out for a little while, and gave them Money to support them until the next Board Day. "

After that, do you know that any fresh Inmates were sent into the House?

Regularly.

After that, do you know that the Gruel was continued, and large Quantities of Oatmeal purchased for the Purpose?

Yes.

Will you refer to any Document which will inform the Committee that any Purchases were made of Gruel?

Mr. Baker's Letter does not give the Dates of his Statement; but the Gruel was regularly used up to the 21st of April.

How do you know that? From what Document do you show that the Gruel was regularly used up to the 21st of April?

The Fact of our applying on the 14th of April and on the 21st to get the Use of Gruel discontinued, in which we succeeded on the 21st; up to that Time it was a regular Article of Diet.

Have you any Entries showing up to what Time the Oatmeal was ordered in?

Yes. October 25th, a Hundred Weight of Oatmeal; November 1st, Half a Hundred Weight of Oatmeal. I will take Two Entries, the one from the Visiting or Medical Book, showing the State of Health, and the other the ordering of the Oatmeal. " 1st November. There is still much Sickness. 1st.half a Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered.- 29th. Still much Sick ness. One Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered.-13th December. Much Sickness is still prevalent in the House.-- 6th. One Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered.-20th. Half a Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered.-27th. One Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered.- 3d January 1837. The Inmates again unhealthy, particularly the Children who have had the Measles.-Toth. One Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered.-31st. Generally unhealthy. " 31st. One Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered, 14th February. Generally unhealthy.-14th. One Hundred Weight of Oatmeal ordered. " That goes on to the 21st of April.

Did the Medical Man ever report this Complaint to the Board as infectious? :

I do not know; I was not a Member of the Board; it was a Matter of public Notoriety.

You say the Guardians would not venture into the Workhouse; did not the Visiting Committee go to the Workhouse during that Period?

Mr. Baker and those Members of the Visiting Committee can speak to tell own Knowledge of that Fact better than I can.

The Board of Guardians was not held in the same Place as the Workhouse, was it?

No.

913 *Do you know that the Guardians abstained more during that period from visiting the Workhouse than they did at former Periods?*

I cannot know that from my own Knowledge

When you say that the Guardians abstained from visiting the Workhouse in consequence of its being notorious that this Complaint in the Workhouse was infectious, you do not mean to say that they abstained at that Time more than any other Time?

Yes, I do. Mr. Baker has told me, and the Governor of the Workhouse told me so, that he believed that for more than Two Months they kept from the House; but I have no personal Knowledge of it.

You say that the Medical Man did not report that it was infectious; are you aware that on the 6th of December Mr. King did report that it would be desirable not to admit Persons above the Age of Sixty, having ulcerated Legs, into the Workhouse?

No; I was not a Guardian at that Time.

And that the Board was of opinion that the Medical Officer should be consulted before Admission?

I was not aware of that; I was not a Guardian at the Time.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Twelve o'Clock