

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

1

563

Die Jovis, 14 Junii 1838.

The Lord WHARNCLIFFE in the Chair.

Mr. ROBERT UNDERDOWN is called in,
and further examined as - follows:

WHAT Books have you got there ?

I have got the Minute Book, the Letter Book,
the Book in which the Letters are all pasted from
the Formation of the Union, and Two or Three
Medical Books, all that could be got.

Have you got the Visiting Committee's Book?

I have not.

*Have you the Book in which the Answers of the
Visiting Committee to the Guardians are inserted?*

I have not that here.

*From what Book are the Observations in the
printed Papers before the Committee taken ?*

Those Observations are from that Book,
meaning the Visitor's Book. There is also a Book
called the Visitor's Book, that is for Persons who
visit the House; that was not kept till we got
into the new House. There was only Half an
Hour after the Arrival of my Letter (my Letters
did not come to Hand for Hour or an Hour and
a Half after the Mail) to get together the Books
which have been sent up by my Son.

What have you now before you?

The Minute Book.

*Will you turn to Page 168 of that Book, and read
the Resolution respecting the Medical Officers which
was then formed ?*

It is the 26th of May 1837. "Moved by the
Reverend N. Ruddock and seconded by K. M. King,
Esquire, That no Gentleman who is not at present a
Medical Officer under this Union be eligible to fill that
Situation unless he has passed his Examination at the
Apothecaries Hall, and is also a Member of the College of
Surgeons; which Motion, on a Division, was negatived."

*Before that had not Notice been given that the
Union would proceed to elect Medical Gentlemen for
the Districts?*

The first Advertisement was dated the 22d of
May; the Order was given on the 19th.

*When was the Advertisement inserted in the
Newspaper ?*

I do not think it was in the Newspaper; I
think it was by Circular Notices sent round to
the Medical Officers in the immediate
Neighbourhood.

*In consequence of that Advertisement did you
receive Refusals from the Medical Officers to accept
the Situations upon those Terms ?*

June the 2d a Letter was sent by the Medical
Officers.

*Can you say, or not, whether the Advertisement
was inserted in the Newspaper?*

I am not certain ; I should think it was, from
the Minute that appears in the Minute Book.

What are those other Books you have ?

Those other Books are the Medical Report
Books; the large one is that in which the Letters
are pasted.

564 *Have you any Medical Report during the
Period that the Diarrhoea prevailed?*

I have the Medical Reports of the Bridgwater
Workhouse, I believe, at that Time.

*Is there a Medical Report made out every Week by
the Medical Officer, and laid before the Board of
Guardians ?*

Yes.

Does the Chairman put his Initials to it?

Not generally, I think.

When did the Diarrhoea begin?

I cannot tell without reference to the Books.

Do you know Mr. Poole?

I do, perfectly.

*Did he complain to you that the Diarrhoea was
prevailing, or did Mr. King?*

Not that I am aware of.

*Can you take upon you positively, to state that
neither Mr. King nor Mr. Poole mentioned to you
that the Diarrhoea prevailed ?*

They may have mentioned it; I cannot charge
my Memory with that.

*Was it not known that the Diarrhoea did prevail
to a very great Degree?*

It was, I believe, known that the Diarrhoea
prevailed in the House.

*Was not it known that the Diarrhoea did prevail
to a very great Degree amongst a great Number of
Patients, and that many died ?*

I know nothing of that of my own
Knowledge.

*Was not it commonly spoken of that the Diarrhoea
was prevailing?*

I never heard it as a general Report.

*Did you not write that Letter now shown to you
on the 21st of April 1837?*

That is my Letter.

*Did you know at that Time that it prevailed?
Certainly, I knew it at that Time; I knew it from*

the Visiting Committee having so reported it at the Board.

From whom did you receive the Report?

It was reported at the Board by the Committee.

Then the Board knew it as well as you?

Yes.

You wrote that Letter by Order of the Board?

Yes.

Was not it well known at the Time that the Diarrhoea prevailed, and that Sixty Persons were affected?

I can speak only from the Minutes. My Engagements are very pressing, and I cannot bear every thing in mind.

Were you present when Mr. Abraham King, the Medical Officer, attended the Board, on the 21st of April 1837?

Yes. I never was absent on a Board Day.

Do you remember that he confirmed the Report of the Visiting Committee that the Paupers, above Sixty, who were allowed Tea and Sugar did not suffer from Diarrhoea so much as those who were dieted on Gruel?

That I recollect perfectly well.

Did he recommend that Rice should be substituted for Gruel?

Yes, I believe he did.

Had the Diarrhoea continued to any considerable Extent for any Length of Time before that?

From my own Knowledge I cannot state that.

Will you refer to the Minute Book to see whether it appears from the Book that for some Time previous to April 1837 the Diarrhoea had prevailed in the Workhouse to a considerable Extent? -

There is a Minute of Mr. King's Attendance, and what he said upon the Subject.

565 *Is there not an Entry in the Minute Book of the 25th of October 1836?*

There is no Date in the Minute Book of the 25th of October.

What was the nearest Day to the 25th that the Guardians met ?

The 27th.

Have you got with you the Book which records the Health of the Paupers from the 21st of April 1837 for Five or Six Months backwards?

The Medical Returns I have with me, but I have not got the Visitor's Book; those Books are in the Possession of the Medical Officers; I only see them Week by Week when the Board meets.

Whose Book is that now shown to you ?

The Medical Officer's.

Who was the Medical Officer ?

Mr. King was the Medical Officer at that Time for the Bridgwater Workhouse. -

He is in attendance ?

He is.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. ABRAHAM KING is called in, and examined as follows:

You are a Surgeon?

I am.

Where do you reside?

At Bridgwater.

How long have you been in practice at Bridgwater?

Three Years last February.

You were appointed a Medical Officer to one of the Districts in the Bridgwater Union ?

I was.

What was it?

The Bridgwater District.

Had you charge of the Workhouse?

Yes, that belonging to Bridgwater.

There was another Workhouse at Petherton ?

There was.

Who attended that?

Mr. Tilsley.

When were you first appointed to the Medical Charge of the Bridgwater District?

Before Midsummer 1836.

What Population had you under your Charge?
8,833, I think.

What was your Salary?

£100

You served as Medical Officer during the Year up to June 1837?

I was assisted by Mr. Poole; I was occasionally ill, and he did my Duty.

You were the Medical Officer?

I was the principal Medical Officer.

In May 1837 other Terms were proposed to you?

Yes.

566 *They made some Alteration with respect to the Numbers in the different Districts?*

They did.

Upon that Occasion were you offered the Bridgwater Parish again?

It was advertised.

It was open to any one to offer?

I wrote a Letter to the Board, stating that I

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

3

could not take it on the Terms they offered; after they advertised I offered for the Bridgwater District.

What were the Terms they offered? They offered for the Bridgwater District 70l. for a Population of 7,807.

Did you write a Letter individually, or a joint Letter with other Persons?

I wrote a Letter myself, and got some of my Medical Friends to sign it.

In fact, you wrote the Letter now shown you ?

It was not exactly in those Words; but I formed a Letter somewhat similar; it was slightly altered by some of the others; I signed it as it appears.

Was that Letter which appears in Page 61 of the Papers before this Committee the Letter to which you signed your Name?

Yes.

In consequence of that Letter was any thing done by the Guardians; did they make any Answer to that?

No. I heard from Reports that the Board of Guardians made use of very strong Terms against us.

Where did you hear that?

It came from some of the Guardians.

Those other Gentlemen who signed a Sort of Approval of your Letter, were

Some of them Medical Officers under the Union ?

Yes

How came they to sign this Addition to your Letter?

Being nearly all of us young Men, we considered it desirable to take the Advice of our Seniors; I for one was very anxious at all Times to avail myself of such Experience as we could obtain from them, and I requested Mr. Parker to take the Letter as first written, which was altered somewhat, and it was taken to the old Practitioners of the Town; they concurred in our Views, and added a Postscript.

Was there any Association of Medical Persons at Bridgwater formed before you wrote that Letter?

Certainly not.

You merely laid the Letter before those other Gentlemen as being your Seniors, to see how far they approved of it?

Yes.

In writing this Letter you were not acting under the Direction of any Association ?

Not at all.

What Period elapsed between the Time of your sending that Letter and it being sanctioned by the additional Signatures of the Nine Medical Gentlemen which appear at the Bottom of Page 62?

It was immediate.

Both those Letters were signed previous to the Letter which you wrote and sent to the Board of Guardians on the 6th of June 1837?

I think the Signatures of the old Gentlemen were added as a Postscript to the Letter.

Very shortly after that you and the other Six Gentlemen who signed with you sent in a Letter on the 6th of June to the Chairman of the Board of Guardians of the Bridgwater Union ?

Yes; that Letter was in consequence of our not getting a Reply.

567 *How came the first Letter not to be dated?*

It only shows that we were not Men of Business. I cannot answer that in any other Way.

It was in point of fact written on the 2d of June, as appears by your Letter of the 6th of June?

Yes.

Would there not have been the same Opinion expressed in that Letter in any Part of that Year, whatever might have been the Date of that Letter?

During 1836 and 1837, I repeatedly stated to some of the Guardians how very inadequately I was remunerated. I stated at the Time that I was sinking Money by it; and at the End of the Year, after receiving expressly a Promise from the Chairman that we should be consulted as to the Amount of our Duties, this Circular was issued, offering me my District, a Population of 7,800, for 70l. a Year.

Were not you consulted with respect to the Population of the Districts?

No.

Were not you called before the Board, and told that the Guardians intended to alter the Districts in the Manner stated in the Advertisement of the 22d of June ?

We were called before the Board relative to the Alteration of the Districts. I was then about to make a few Observations relative to my District, and the Chairman instantly said: me; it was touching on the Register Act; being the Registrar of the District, how convenient it would be to have a certain Parish thrown into my District; and the Chairman said, "That is foreign to the . Subject, Mr. King, and we cannot hear it."

What were the Subjects on which you were summoned?

Simply to give our Opinions as to the Convenience of the Districts.

The Chairman stopped you because you were proceeding to bring in the Subject of Registration ?

Yes. -

Mixing the Registration with the Medical Attendance?

Yes, but I was going on; had not the Chairman stopped me I should have gone fully into my Objections to the District; but in consequence of being stopped, and being rather nervous, I did not address him afterwards; he cut me rather short.

Was it with respect to the Convenience of the Districts you were about to speak, or the Salaries?

The Convenience of the Districts.

You were summoned for the Purpose of being consulted about that?

We were. Before that my District was Bridgwater, Chedzoy, Durleigh, Wembdon, and Chilton Trinity. I am Registrar of that District. I was about to state to Mr. Werry that it would be very convenient to throw in the Parish of Chedzoy with the Parish of Bridgwater, on account of my being Registrar, as I could do the Duty more conveniently, than another Person; but he stopped me in consequence of hearing the Word "Registration."

Your Suggestion was made with a view to adjusting the Registration System rather than altering the Medical District?

It would have assisted me as well, provided I had taken the District. .

The Day you attended, pursuant to the Order of the Guardians, was the 18th of May, was not it? -

Yes.

Was there any Conversation at that Time with respect to your Salaries?

None whatever.

Did you ever express yourself, or did your Colleagues express themselves, satisfied with the Salaries they had received in the previous Year?

They never said any thing upon the Subject
568 *Were they ever asked ?*

They were never asked. I had expressed to many of the Guardians, during the Year, how very inadequately I was remunerated.

But upon that Occasion you were not asked upon the Subject, and said nothing upon the Subject?

In consequence of being stopped by the Chairman I did not enter into any thing further.

You have stated that you were not satisfied with your Salary; were the other Medical Officers, to your

Knowledge, satisfied or dissatisfied with the Salaries they had received the preceding Year?

I have heard them complain.

Did not they sign a Letter with you, expressing their Dissatisfaction ?

They did.

As far as you had an Opportunity of knowing their Opinions, were they satisfied or dissatisfied ?

Dissatisfied.

Have you had Opportunities of conversing with them upon the Subject?

Yes.

Are you prepared to say whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with the Terms the preceding Year?

I can say that some were dissatisfied.

Can you speak to the Names?

Mr. Poole was dissatisfied; Mr. Caswell, Mr. Tilsley, Mr. Baruch Toogood.

Mr. Ruddock ?

I never heard him express an Opinion.

Mr. Addison?

I never heard him express an Opinion.

Whatever their Opinions may be, are you of opinion the Salaries were not sufficient to enable you to do Justice to the Poor?

As far as my District was concerned, certainly not.

You have stated that to the Guardians?

Yes, to some of them.

Did you ever state that to the Board itself?

I was never called upon by the Board to state any thing upon the Subject, and never did. I was not allowed to be present at the Board.

All the Surgeons attended that Meeting on the 18th of May ?

Yes.

They did not present themselves singly before the Board of Guardians, but the whole of them were present in the Room at the same Time?

Yes.

Did any of the other Medical Gentlemen then present make any Observations as to the Amount of their Salaries on that Occasion ?

None whatever. The only Observation that was made on that Day was an Observation from Mr. Tilsley relative to Midwifery. That was not in connexion with the Salaries.

There was no Question put to them with reference to their Opinion on the Amount of their Salary? -

No.

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

5

Had the Board any Means of knowing, from any Statement made to them by the Surgeons on that Occasion, that they were dissatisfied with the Salaries?

Many of them knew it. We did not state it then, not being spoken to upon the Subject.

569 *Did the Gentlemen express their Dissatisfaction to the Guardians in your Presence?*

No; simply in the Conversation I may have had with them.

Were there any Questions put to you with respect to the Result of your Experience in those Districts as to the Amount of Duty you had to perform ?

No Question at all. The only Question with which I can tax my Memory at present was, when we were about to leave, the Chairman put the Question, whether we were perfectly satisfied.

Perfectly satisfied with what?

I never rightly understood what he meant.

Did you consult with your Colleagues, and understand from them what their View was?

No ; we were about to leave the Room, and we separated; we never consulted upon the Subject.

You did not conceive that to refer to the Salaries?

Not after the Chairman said to me that it was foreign to the Subject.

You were called before the Guardians to be consulted or be made acquainted with the new geographical Arrangement of the Districts?

Yes.

You confined yourself entirely to that in consequence of having been stopped by the Chairman when you wanted to refer to some other Subject?

Yes.

Therefore you did not make any Observation expressive either of Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction, except such as would bear upon the geographical Distribution of the Districts?

No.

When they told you the geographical Distribution, did they not state the Salary it was proposed each Medical Man was to receive?

I believe the Salaries were not fixed at that Time.

Was any thing said of this Sort, that it was not intended to take the Salaries into consideration that Day?

I do not recollect any thing of the Kind.

Will you refer to your Letter in Page 62, and say whether it is not stated that there was a distinct

Declaration made to some of the undersigned that it was not intended to take the Medical Salaries into consideration on that Day?

The Declaration was not made to me.

Who composed that Letter which you appear to have signed?

Baruch Toogood brought it to me: I concurred in the principal Part of it.

You did not concur in the whole?

This Declaration was not made to me; I believed the Gentleman that the Declaration had been made to him.

That was Mr. Toogood?

Yes.

Upon your Faith in Mr. Toogood you put your Name to that Letter?

Yes.

Upon what Occasion — or has there been on any Occasion any thing like an Intimation that at the End of the First Year, which would be necessarily a Year of Probation and Inquiry, the Question of the Salaries would be recon sidered?

Yes, there was.

How was that conveyed to you?

From the Chairman the First Year.

570 *From the Chairman sitting at the Board*

Yes.

Who was the Chairman ?

Mr. Warry.

When the Circular was issued with the new Salaries and the new Distribution you had not been examined at all with respect to your Experience during the former Year ?

We had not.

That you conceived to be unjust towards yourselves?

I did so, certainly.

In the Bridgwater District your poor Patients were within a reasonable Distance of you; how far had you to go?

The extreme Point, Chedzoy, was about Three Miles.

You had been in Practice for a Year in the same Place ?

Yes.

Had you kept a Horse?

I had Parishes before, and kept a Horse for that Purpose.

You had contracted for some Parishes before the new Law ?

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

Day 2 Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

6

Yes.

For what Parishes ?

Bawdrip and Bridgwater.

Do you know the Population of those Parishes?

Bridgwater about 7,800, and Bawdrip about 250 or 300, I should imagine.

What were you paid under the old Poor Law for those Parishes as the Medical Attendant ?

£100 for the Parish of Bridgwater, and 6*l.* for the Parish of Bawdrip; and all Extras, such as Midwifery and Fractures, in the Parish of Bawdrip were extra. The last Bill I received from them was 26*l.*, 6*l.* of which was Salary.

Was that when you were united with Mr. Parker and Mr. Poole in a certain Number of Parishes in the Neighbourhood of Bridgwater?

Yes.

Did the Two Parishes you have named form the whole District you undertook?

Yes.

You were united with Two other Gentlemen in superintending the Medical Care of a larger District than that you have just mentioned?

I will state how the Parish of Bridgwater stood; we divided the Duties between us.

How many Parishes had you, Three altogether ?

We had only One divided between us, all the others were distinct.

You contracted separately for other Parishes, but the Parish of Bridgwater was taken between you?

Yes.

*When you say the Salary of Bridgwater was 100*l.*, did you receive 100*l.* and the other Gentleman receive any thing also ?*

No ; it was 100*l.* between us.

That covered the Midwifery Cases and Surgical Cases?

Yes, with the Exception of suspended Orders, which we had extra.

In that Year what did you get upon suspended Orders ?

I cannot answer that.

Was it considerable or trifling?

The Parish of St. Decuman's used to pay Mr. Parker a great deal, but the Amount I cannot say; I never received any thing on suspended Orders myself.

571

Is that One Parish in Bridgwater ?

There are a Number of Parishioners living in Bridgwater belonging to the Parish of St.

Decuman's, which is near Watchet; they come up to get employed on the Quays.

Mr. Parker had that Part of the Parish, and had therefore all that Advantage?

Yes.

*For the Parish of Bridgwater, together with the Parish of Bawdrip, you had first of all a Salary of 6*l.* for Bawdrip, and a Bill which you say amounted to 20*l.*, and One Third of 100*l.* ?*

Yes.

You kept a Horse during that Time?

I did.

When you had the Poor of the Parish thrown upon you did you require another Horse or did One Horse still do your Business?

The Parish of Bawdrip was taken from me under the new System, and I only required the same Horse.

The Parish of Bawdrip was a very small Parish in point of Population ; supposing that to have adjoined to Bridgwater, should you have required more Assistance in the Horse Way?

No ; I think a Person might perform the Duties of Bridgwater without a Horse.

You had besides Chedzoy, Wembdon, Durleigh, and Chilton Trinity added to the Parish of Bridgwater ?

Yes.

Did those Parishes require a Horse ?

Yes.

You could not have attended those Parishes without riding ?

No.

Did One Horse answer your Purpose still ?

Yes.

Can you give the Committee an Idea of the greatest Number of Patients you ever were called upon to attend in any Week in Bridgwater and those other Parishes

I think during the Influenza I had to attend, assisted by Mr. Poole, 160.

When was the Influenza you speak of ?

In January and February 1837.

In the Average State of Health of the District what do you conceive would be likely to be your Number of Patients?

It would average between Sixty and Seventy; sometimes, of course, it would be less than at others.

How many Days in the Week do you reckon you would have been occupied in visiting the sick Paupers in the District ?

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

7

Every Day in the Week.

You would of course have some independent Patients besides ?

Very few.

Your Employment was almost entirely confined to those Persons?

Nearly so.

Does this Book now shown to you relate to the Bridgwater District, or only the Workhouse?

At the Commencement the Bridgwater District and the Workhouse were entered together in the same Book; some few Months afterwards there was a separate Book provided.

572

Do you recollect the Date when you left off entering the Patients in the Workhouse in the same Book?

25th March 1837. This Book now shown to me appears to be the Work. house Book from the 25th of March 1837.

Are the Workhouse Patients included in your Average?

Yes.

Can you give the Committee any Idea of the Average Expense incurred in Medicines for each Patient ?

I have taken an Extract from the British Medical Almanac; and for a Number of Infirmarys and Hospitals it is averaged at about 2s. 1d. or 2s. 2d. per Case.

Do you concur in the Opinion expressed in that Medical Almanac ?

I should think about 2s. 8d. a Case is about the Truth; I am speaking from Recollection.

Do you mean for Medicines only

Yes.

Do you include Cases of Midwifery in that Calculation ?

Certainly not.

Do you consider that there are on the Average Sixty or Seventy Cases of Patients per Week throughout the Year?

I can give the Quarterly Return. For Nine Months that I attended there were 1,200 Patients; take One Third more, that will give yearly 1,600 Patients; that would give me about 1s. 8d. per Case.

Is that now shown you the Book from the Beginning of the Union ?

Yes.

It comprehends the Parish as well as the Workhouse?

Yes.

Can you tell when it ceased to comprehend the Parish as well as the Work house ?

From the 25th of March 1837 the Book now shown me became the Out door Book.

What would the Medicine for that District, when contracted for at 70l. a Year, cost you?

I have not calculated that.

In the Year before did you ever make out what the Medicines for your Third of the Parish of Bridgwater and the Parish of Bawdrip cost you?

No, I have made no Calculation; taking it upon the whole Number on the Quarterly Returns, many of the Cases passed on from one Quarter to another; therefore that does not give a correct Return of the Number of Cases I attended.

Do you know the total Number of Patients you attended in the course of the Year while you attended the Parishes of Bridgwater and Bawdrip?

I cannot say.

Under the Union, what was the total Number of Cases you attended in the District of Bridgwater in the course of the Year?

The only Way in which I can state that is by giving the Quarterly Returns, but I find I have not got them here.

Do you think that there were on the Average Sixty per Week throughout that Year ?

Yes.

When you received the Third Part of 100l., and what you have stated from the Parish of Bawdrip besides, did that remunerate you for the Patients you were called upon to attend to there?

Considering that it was Parish Business, and looking upon it in the light of Parish Business, and as an Introduction, we considered it as such.

573 *Do you mean to say that with the Salary under the old Law you would not have undertaken it but for its being an Introduction to other Practice?*

Certainly not.

You would not have taken it as a Source of Profit?

Certainly not; there was no Profit.

When you took the Parish of Bridgwater and other Parishes under the new Poor Law, what was your Motive for taking them at a less Salary than under the old Poor Law ?

I took it in the same Way as an Introduction, and expecting at the End of the Year a liberal Advance.

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

Day 2 Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589

Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

8

You took it not only as an Introduction to other Practice, but as a Means of acquiring additional Experience ?

Yes, we acquire Experience, certainly; but I do not think that entered my Mind at the Time.

What Age were you at that Time?

At the Time I took the Union I was Five or Six and twenty.

When was it you altered your Opinion, and declined to take the Bridgwater Parish under the Contract at a Salary of 70l. a Year, you having taken it before under a Salary which you say did not remunerate you; why did you not continue to take that Parish at the 70l. a Year?

It was so far reduced; 30l. a Year cut off from 100l.

Do you mean to say that the Circumstance of its being an Introduction was not sufficient to balance the Reduction ?

I thought not at the Time.,

Do you still continue to think so?

Yes.

Was not the Population which was to be committed to your Care reduced as well as the Salary?

Yes, certainly.

Did not the 100l. also comprehend the Workhouse?

Part of the Workhouse only.

The Workhouse in Bridgwater ?

Yes.

Did the Business for which you were to be paid the 70l. comprehend the Petherton Workhouse?

Certainly not.

That was taken out as well as 1,000 of the Population?

Not quite 1,000, I think.

Looking back at it, do you still think that if you had continued to serve the Union at a Salary of 70l. for the Bridgwater Parish only you would not have been remunerated by that Salary?

Certainly not.

You would still adhere to the Refusal you then made?

Yes.

Do you think any Gentleman would take it at that Rate who would do Justice to the Paupers?

I should not be surprised if there were Persons to be found who would take it.

It is taken ?

It is let at 100l. a Year.

The Parish of Bridgwater alone?

Yes; and 30l. a Year for the Workhouse added to it.

With the same Reduction of Population?

Yes.

574 *Do you mean to say that the Parish alone is let at 100l. a Year, and the Workhouse at 30l. more ?*

Yes.

Who has taken it at 130l. ?

Mr. Ward.

Was he then resident in Bridgwater?

No, he was not.

Where did he come from ?

It is said from Newcastle-upon-Tyne; but I know not.

He had never been heard of in Bridgwater before that Time?

No.

He took it at 70l. ?

No.

When he took it, he took it at 100l. ?

Yes. -

Was there any greater District added to it in consequence of his having 100l. ?

No. I offered myself, in a Letter to the Board, to take it at 97l 11s. 9d., that was at 3d, a Head on the gross Population, and to give up a Bill of 65l. I had upon the Board.

After your Refusal to accept the Offer of the Board, you made an Offer to attend the Poor gratuitously ?

Yes.

That was refused ?

Yes.

You then made another Offer to attend them as private Patients?

No.

The Bill you offered to give up was for attending them as private Patients?

Yes.

You offered to attend them at 3d. a Head on the gross Population, and to give up a Bill contracted under the Direction of the Board ?

Yes.

When was that?

At the End of my first Year.

That was before it was let to Mr. Ward ?

Yes.

How long after that was it let to Mr. Ward for 100l. ?

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

9

At the End of Three Weeks; the Election took place at that Time. I sent a Letter to the Board, on the Day that the Election was about to take place, expressly stating that I was willing and ready to meet the Board, and that I would take the Parish of Bridgwater at what I considered a remunerating Price. I offered at 97l. 11s. 9d., it being 3d. a Head on the gross Population of the District; and I said in this Letter that I would make them a Present of that Bill provided they elected me, which would show that I had no ill Feeling towards the Board.

Was there any Dispute of your having a just Right to that Bill?

Not the slightest. -

Afterwards it was disputed?

Yes.

Did you bring an Action? No, as I was willing to accede to the Board's Terms in any Way, I gave way to them in every thing. -

Are you sure they got that Letter before they proceeded to the Election at which Mr. Ward was elected ?

Certainly.

575 *Did you receive an Answer to that Letter?*

I do not think I did.

Since that Offer to take it at 8d. a Head, which would have amounted to 97l. 11s. 9d., have you had any Communication whatever with the Board of Guardians?

Simply relative to my Bill; I wanted to be paid; I think I wrote, and asked them for Payment.

The other Gentlemen, Mr. Tilsley, Mr. Poole, Mr. Caswell, and Mr. Rud dock, also wrote to the Board offering Terms at the same Time as you did; did not they?

Yes.

And you knew of your own Knowledge that their Letters were delivered before the Board proceeded to the Election of Medical Officers?

I went, with my own Letter and Mr. Caswell's and Mr. Poole's, to the Office over Night, and delivered the Letters; I suppose they were read.

How long had you the Care of this Parish under the old Law and the new One ?

I had the Parish of Bawdrip One Year before the Formation of the Union. I had the Parish of Bridgwater, in conjunction with Mr. Poole and Parker, from Lady Day 1836 up to Midsummer 1836, and then a Twelvemonth under the new System.

During all that Time was there any Complaint against you?

None at all.

You say the Parish of Bridgwater, though advertised at 70l., is actually let at 100l.; can you speak to the Terms on which the other Districts are let?

The Bridgwater District was increased to 100l.; the Huntspill District was increased from 40l to 50l. -

That is now taken ?

That was taken; Polden and Hill Districts were let at those Salaries fixed here.

Was Middlezoy District continued at 35l. ?

I cannot answer that Question. North Petherton was increased to 75l.

Are they all occupied?

Yes, they were during the Year 1837.

Cannington ?

I cannot say.

Stowey?

I cannot answer that; the Union Workhouse, 30l.

Do you know whether they are taken by Persons who are duly licensed?

I scarcely know how to answer that Question; Gentlemen are so tenacious of what they mean by the Term licensed. I should not consider myself qualified to take a District unless I was both a Surgeon and Apothecary; Mr. Ward is not, I believe, a Member of the College of Surgeons; I cannot find his Name in the College List; he is an Apothecary. Mr. Phillips, who is in possession of the Polden District, has neither an Apothecary's Certificate nor a Certificate from the College of Surgeons. Mr. Caswell of the Huntspill District was duly qualified. The Hill District; Mr. Young is a Surgeon and not an Apothecary.

Middlezoy ?

That is let to Mr. Young; he has Two Districts. North Petherton is with Mr. Tilsley; he is duly qualified in both.

Cannington ?

Duly qualified.

Stowey?

Duly qualified.

576 *What do you mean by duly qualified; being both Surgeon and Apothecary?*

Yes.

Does the Law require that they should be both Surgeons and Apothecaries?

The Poor Law Commissioners say that a Man must be duly licensed to practise.

What do you mean by being a Surgeon; do you mean having passed an Examination at Surgeons Hall ?

Yes.

Is a Person qualified to attend Surgical Cases who has no Knowledge of Surgery, and has only passed as an Apothecary?

If he has no Knowledge of Surgery he is not qualified to attend.

Do not Surgical Cases frequently occur ?

Certainly.

What you mean to say is, that no Person is duly qualified to be a Surgeon if he has not passed his Examination at Surgeons Hall?

That is my Opinion.

There are Persons who do practise without having passed that?

Yes.

There are Persons who are Apothecaries who practise without having passed at Surgeons Hall?

Yes.

How do those Persons receive their Education ?

They pass through the Hospitals, I suppose.

How is it ascertained that they have attended to their Education sufficiently to practise as Surgeons if they do not pass at Surgeons Hall?

We have no Means of ascertaining it except by Certificate of their Practice.

So that if a Person had attended the Hospitals, and so forth, and had not afterwards passed Surgeons Hall, the Public would have no Security that he had gone through the proper Course of Education ?

That is a Point of Law I cannot enter into. It is my own Feeling that if I acted as a Surgeon, and I performed any Operation, and it happened to be unfortunate, I should be guilty of Manslaughter.

Is there any one you have not mentioned who is not duly qualified ?

I do not think Mr. Addison is a Member of the College.

You do not mean to make any Question of their Fitness; but you mean to say they are not Members of the Two Colleges of Surgeons and Apothecaries?

Yes.

Where did Mr. Phillips come from ; is he resident at Bridgwater?

He has been resident many Years in the Neighbourhood; he was in practice before the passing of the Act of 1815.

You say Mr. Tilsley has the North Petherton District ?

He has.

You say the Pay for that District is 75l. ?

I believe it is.

Do you know how Mr. Tilsley, after signing the Letter with you, which you drew up, came to take that District?

Because the Salary was increased.

Did they, at the Time he had it, increase it to 75l., or did he take it at 55l., and has it been since increased to 75l. ?

The Day on which they elected Mr. Ward at 130l. they elected Mr. Tilsley at the advanced Salary of 75l. He attended the Patients and provided Medicines, and had a Bill of 15l. upon the Board, the whole of which was paid Without any Demur

577 *The Bridgwater District, instead of being let for 70l. is let for 30l. more with 30l. for the workhouse?*

Yes

That 30l. includes the new Bridgwater Workhouse, which was not then built?

I had the old Workhouse under my Care.

It contained only a Portion of the Poor?

Yes

The new Workhouse lately built in Bridgwater contains the whole ?

Yes.

Though that new Union Workhouse was not inhabited before you attended there was another Workhouse which has been discontinued?

Yes.

With respect to the North Petherton District, that had been let to Mr. Tilsley before for 63l.?

Yes.

The Population he attended to for that 68l. was rather more than the Population he has in North Petherton now ; was it not?

The First Year he took it for 68l., with a Population of 4,967; the Second Year the Population was reduced to 4,679; for that District he has 75l. a Year.

They proposed to pay for that only 55l., and he would not take it?

Just so.

Do you know whether there was any other Offer made for that District ?

No, there was not.

You wrote that first Letter, which is without a Date, but which in fact was written or sent on the 2d of June 1837?

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589

Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

I believe I stated to the Committee that I wrote a Letter, the Substance of which this corresponds with ; but the Wording is somewhat different.

Did the Gentlemen who signed it, Mr. Tilsley, Mr. Toogood, Mr. Poole, Mr. Ruddock, Mr. Addison, Mr. Caswell, and yourself, all meet together to sign it, or was it signed at different Places?

It was signed by them at their different Houses.

Do you know whether Mr. Jonathan Toogood and the other Gentlemen met together, or whether it was sent round ?

I cannot say.

You made the Alterations suggested in the first Draught?

No.

In whose Hands was it after you signed it?

I delivered it to Mr. Parker after I signed it.

You do not know how it went round to the other Gentlemen?

No.

Did not you apply to Mr. Weale, as Poor Law Commissioner of the Union, together with Mr. Poole and Mr. Parker, on the Subject of being appointed Medical Officer to Parts of the District?

I recollect having an Interview with Mr. Weale.

Did you not write that Letter?

No.

Did you not send a Letter to him ?

I have no Recollection of having done so.

Were you in Connexion with Mr. Poole and Mr. Parker in attendance on certain Parishes?

Yes; I recollect having an Interview with Mr. Weale.

578 *What was the Object of the Interview ?*

I believe Mr. Parker wished to state to Mr. Weale the great Hardship of his losing so many of his Parishes; but the Conversation I can hardly state, it is so long ago.

And the great Hardship of any young Men being introduced into the District?

I do not recollect the Contents of the Letter.

It has been suggested that the Objection on your Part to taking this District was from a Feeling adverse to the Administration of the Poor Law; is that so?

Quite the contrary.

Was the Objection taken because you thought the Offer made was not a sufficient Remuneration for your Services ?

Entirely that.

Can you, for any Continuance, possibly do the Duty required for that Salary without Loss?

Certainly not.

Can you state whether the Poor have in any Manner suffered from the Resolution offering the Appointment at those small Remunerations?

I think the Poor suffered during the Three Weeks that we attended them as private Patients.

In what respect did they suffer?

In some Cases in not getting Relief in proper Time.

There were some Instances of that?

There were.

Were those Instances numerous?

I can state Four or Five Instances where they were refused Relief.

What happened in consequence; did any of them die?

Yes; poor Cook's Child died.

In consequence of being refused Relief?

Yes.

By whom ?

The Relieving Officer refused Relief early in the Morning to this poor Child.

When did the Child die?

The following Evening; it was a Case of Croup.

Was that in consequence of the Board of Guardians giving you a less Sum for your Services than you thought yourself entitled to have ?

It was during my Attendance on the Poor as private Patients. The Relieving Officers were directed to be sparing in their orders.

Do you know that?

There is a Letter signed by one of the Relieving Officers in possession of me of my Friends.

In consequence of that did any Persons suffer ?

This poor Child died. The poor Child was taken ill at Seven or Eight in the Morning; I did not see the Child until between Twelve and One o'Clock. Such a Case requires prompt Attention.

Are you aware that the Application was made and refused ?

Yes; the Mother came to me, and I sent her back to the Relieving Officer, saying, she ought to have a Doctor.

Upon what Day did she come to you?

The same Morning.

How came you to go afterwards?

I had an Order from the Relieving Officer.

579 *You got an Order from the Relieving Officer?*

Yes, afterwards.

How long afterwards ?

It was between Twelve and One I saw the Woman again.

At what Time did she first come to you?

Between Nine and Ten.

Had she applied to the Relieving Officer before that?

Yes, as she told me. There is another Case. She told you the Relieving Officer had refused?

Yes.

You sent her to the Relieving Officer again?

Yes.

How far had she to go?

I suppose from my House to the Patient's House is 400 Yards.

How far had she to go to get the Order from the Relieving Officer

It may be 100 or 150 Yards.

Was she all the Time between Nine in the Morning and Twelve getting this Order ?

I suppose so; I do not know what became of her afterwards.

Your Story is that she applied to you at Nine in the Morning?

Between Nine and Ten.

Did you not say before, not only that she had no Order from the Relieving Officer, but that she told you she had been refused an Order from the Relieving Officer ? -

Yes.

The Relieving Officer came and gave me an Order himself, between Twelve and One.

Did he tell you why he had not sent it before?

I do not recollect any Conversation upon the Subject.

If you had been acting for the Board under the Contract, should you have gone more immediately to this young Child with the Croup than you did in the present Case?

We always waited for Orders from the Relieving Officer.

You would have waited, if you had been under Contract, as you did?

Yes.

You did not go till you received the Order from the Relieving Officer ?

No.

The Loss of Time between the first Moment of your hearing of it and the Time you did attend was from Ten o'Clock till One?

Between Twelve and One.

Two Hours were lost?

Yes.

Was there any Magistrate in your immediate Neighbourhood ?

Yes; there were Magistrates, I think, assembled at the Time.

When the Woman came to you, and you refused to attend because you had not an Order from the Relieving Officer, were you aware of the Nature of the Disease?

No; I cannot say that I was ; the Mother said the Child was very ill; the Nature of the Disease I was not aware of till I saw it.

580 *You were not aware that it was Croup?*

No.

You did not tell the Mother that if the Urgency of the Case was so great, the Magistrates were assembled, and she might apply to them to give you an Order ?

I said nothing of the Sort; I told her she must get a Note from the Relieving Officer, and I would immediately attend.

Did you know the Ground of the Relieving Officer's Refusal?

I did not.

Did you know this Person or her Family before ?

Yes, very well.

What is the Father ?

A Shoemaker.

A Man in Business; not a Pauper?

He is a Pauper; he was attended under the old System.

Has he ever been a Pauper under the Union ?

I cannot say.

Was he a Shoemaker in Business?

Working for another Man.

Had not he a Son working with him in Business?

I cannot say.

You do not know that he was a Pauper?

I can only judge from the House or Hovel he was in ; he appeared to be in a state of great Destitution.

Do you know what was the Amount of his Earnings?

That would depend upon whether he was a sober and industrious Man.

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

13

Is he a sober and industrious Man ?

He bears the Character of being a
Cockfighter.

*Your Evidence goes to show that the Life of the
Child was lost from a sufficiently early Attendance
not having been given ?*

That is my Opinion.

*But it does not show what were the
Circumstances of the Father ?*

It does not.

*Whether he was or not able to pay for Medical
Attendance from his own Means you cannot say?*

I can only judge by the Appearance of the
Hovel.

Did he appear to be in a State of Destitution ?

He did ; his House was not at all well
furnished.

Had he the Appearance of Poverty ?

Yes.

*Afterwards you got an Order from the Relieving
Officer ?*

Yes.

*When Mrs. Cook first applied to you, did she
apply to you to attend on the Part of the Parish, or
otherwise ?*

She came and related to me that the Order
was refused.

*Did she apply to you as a Person who was not a
Pauper, to attend on her own Account ?*

Oh no.

Did you inquire that?

She came to me, relating to me that Mr.
Newman had refused her an Order.

Was there any other Case of the same Kind?

Yes; the Case of Mary Winslade; I was called
about Ten o'Clock one Night by Sarah
Crochford.

581 *Was this during the Period you were not
regularly attending under your Appointment?*

Yes. She stated to me that Mary Winslade
was in great Danger, and requested my
Attendance. I ordered my Servant to say to her
that she was to apply to the Relieving Officer for
an Order. She, I believe, I cannot swear that,
went to the Relieving Officer; however she did
not return, nor did any other Person, till
between Twelve and One at Night; I then
repeated the same Message to the Relieving
Officer, stating that it was a Case of imminent
Danger.

*Do you mean that you repeated that to the
Relieving Officer himself?*

No. I considered that it was necessary to
obtain an Order; for, from her Account, the Case
required prompt Attention.

You sent a verbal Message?

Yes.

What happened upon that?

Mr. Newman, the Relieving Officer, sent his
Wife to ascertain whether it was a Case
requiring immediate Attention. She came back
in great Haste to me, and begged I would hurry
to the Spot, for she thought the Woman was in a
very dangerous State. When I came I found her
flooding. I found her in an extreme State of
Syncope, and scarcely a Pulse to be felt; the
whole Bed clothes deluged with Blood; but with
proper Measures I succeeded in arresting the
Hemorrhage, and gave them some Money to get
Brandy and other Necessaries, and restored her.
In the Morning I returned again, and I was
obliged to deliver her to save her Life; but from
the Loss of Blood she became a Maniac, and I
believe has since been in a Madhouse for Eight
Months.

*If she had had more prompt Assistance do you
think that would have been likely to have prevented
her falling into the State you have described ?*

Yes; she was in a State of Delirium when I
came there first.

Who was this Woman ?

She was the Wife of a Sailor, I think.

Was he a Pauper ?

Oh yes, very poor indeed.

Had she applied to the Relieving Officer?

She sent to the Relieving Officer that Night
twice before I went, I believe.

You say you believe?

I told them to go.

*You do not know that they did go to the Relieving
Officer ?*

No.

*Did you ever receive an Order from the Relieving
Officer to go?*

Mrs. Newman came back, after seeing her in
this State of Danger, and requested me to hurry
there, and said that in the Morning Mr.
Newman should give me an Order. and that I
hastily went.

*Did you get an Order from Mr. Newman in the
Morning ?*

Yes.

Did he give any Reason why he had not attended to your Application earlier ?

I do not think I had any Conversation with him.

How much Time was lost after you sent the Message before you received the Order ?

Two Hours and a Half?

How far does he live from you ?

About 150 or 200 Yards.

If there had been immediate Attention given, you might have gone there in a few Minutes ?

Yes.

582 *You were ordered by the Board not to attend in any Case without a written Order ?*

Yes.

That was the Reason you did not go immediately on Sarah Crochford coming to you ?

Yes.

If you had known she was in great Danger, should you have refused to go immediately ?

Yes; for Mr. Caswell had attended a Person in his District under such Circumstances, and the Board refused Payment.

Do you know the Name of that Case ?

No.

Are you Partner with Mr. Ruddock ?

No.

If you had been under a Contract should you then have attended without any Order at all ?

No.

Under the Contract, if the Husband of this Woman had been in the Receipt of Parochial Relief, you would then have attended without an Order; would you not?

Not in a Case of Midwifery.

Not if you had been told that she was in great Danger, and in a State of Hemorrhage?

In consequence of the Refusal of Payment to Mr. Caswell, I should not. He went to attend such a Case as that, and afterwards applied for Payment, and was refused.?

Was he under Contract at the Time ?

Yes.

Have you known other Cases in which the Poor have suffered in consequence of Delay ?

I have known Persons refused and delayed the Relief they ought to have had earlier.

Has Suffering resulted from the Delay ?

Yes.

Are you a Member of the Medical Association which has published a Pamphlet, intituled "Facts connected with the Medical Relief of the Poor in the

Bridgwater Union," in which there is a Statement relating to the Case of Charlotte Allen ?

Yes; but I know nothing of that Case.

Can you justify the Imputation of Manslaughter upon the Guardians of the Union in reference to a Case with which you are wholly unacquainted ?

I know nothing of the Case of Charlotte Allen; but the Facts were supplied by another Medical Gentleman.

You have stated that you sent in a Tender to the Board for an Attendance on the Bridgwater District at 8d. a Head ?

Yes.

And you were a little surprised it was not accepted ?

I did not express any Surprise.

Do you know the Reason they did not accept your Offer?

I cannot tell; I suppose on the Dislike they had towards me. I cannot account for their Conduct at all; their Conduct was quite inexplicable.

To what do you attribute that Dislike ?

To my not taking the District at 70l., I suppose.

583 *Do you not recollect being asked the Question at the Board, whether you could, if you accepted it, act with other Gentlemen?*

No

There is a Minute to this Effect in Proceedings of the Board on the 14th of July 1837: "Mr. Abraham King was called before the Board, and asked if he was under Obligation to prevent his acting professionally with any Gentleman now acting as a Medical Officer under the Union, and he stated that he was ;" do you recollect that taking place?

Certainly a Question was put to me, but not to that Effect. If I recollect, the Question they put was, whether, if I was elected Surgeon to a District, provided Mr. Ward was elected, I would hold any Communication with him ; that was what I understood; and I answered, "Certainly not."

Was this the Question : "Whether, in the event of the Appointment of any non-resident Practitioners who offered in consequence of the Advertisements, he would hold any professional Communication with them; and upon his objecting on the Ground that the Gentlemen had been brought forward to oppose him, against whom not the slightest Complaint had been made, he must decline doing so, he was immediately rejected by a small Majority, and One of the new Candidates elected in his Place; " was that the Question ?

Yes.

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

15

Were you under an Obligation not to act professionally with any Gentleman who should come under those Circumstances into the Union ?

I should say not with any one coming down to oppose me in the Way in which he did.

Do you say that you were under Obligation to no other Person ?

No, I was not.

Did not you enter into an Agreement with other Medical Gentlemen of Bridgwater not to enter into Communication with such Persons ?

That simply applies to Surgeons in the Town.

Did not you bind yourselves together not to enter into Communication with any who came into your District?

No; we had only said that we would not act with any who took Districts in opposition to the foregoing Resolutions.

The Witness was informed, That he might decline answering these Questions in case he felt that his Answers could be used against him in a Charge of illegal Combination.

I had no Feeling at all of injuring any Person. We all, when we passed the College of Surgeons, took an Oath, and this is only acting in accordance with that Oath, that we would uphold the Respectability of our Profession ; and we dishonour our Profession if we communicate with those who so act.

You wrote a Letter, you said, offering to take the Poor at 8d. a Head, on the 16th of June ?

Yes.

You say that was delivered on the Morning of the Day on which Mr. Ward was elected ?

Yes.

Did you keep that in your Pocket till the 14th of July, when that Election was made ?

It was on the final Election that that Offer was made.

You wrote that on the 16th of June, and it appears by the Minutes that your Letter is acknowledged on the 23d of June; the Board do not appear to have proceeded on the Election till the 14th of July, on which Day you were asked the Question which was put to you ?

There must be some Mistake in my Mind as to Dates.

The Question, whether you were bound by any Agreement with any other Persons not to enter into Communications with any Persons under special Circumstances, appears to have been put on the 14th of July, which was the Day of Election? -

I must be mistaken as to the Dates.

584 *Was the Letter sent before or after the Questions you have referred to were put to you?*

Before.

You had offered to take the District at 97l. 11s. 9d. before the Election of Mr. Ward ?

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JOSEPH ADDISON is called in, and examined as follows:

ARE you a Surgeon ?

I am.

Where do you reside ?

At Burrow Bridge, Seven Miles from Bridgwater.

Were you Surgeon of the Middlezoy District from 1836 to 1837?

Yes

Are you still in charge of the District?

I am not.

The Middlezoy District was not a very large one, containing a Population of 2,365 People ?

Yes, 2,560.

What was your Salary?

35l. a Year.

In 1837 there was an Alteration made in the Districts ?

I believe there was.

There was no Alteration made in the Middlezoy District?

I think not till the following Year.

There was the same Parishes and the same Population as before, according to the Advertisement?

Yes.

The same Salary also was affixed to it?

It was.

How came you not to take it again?

Because I thought it was not sufficient.

How came you to take it the First Year for 35l. ?

I understood we should not have so much Trouble as we had had under the old Poor Law, therefore I thought I would try it.

Was any thing said to you about a possible Increase in any Way?

No.

You gave it up because you found it did not answer your Purpose?

I did.

Can you state what it cost you in Medicines that Year ?

Not exactly for the Poor. I did not keep any Account of the Medicines I gave to the Poor alone, independent of my private Practice.

With respect to keeping a Horse, did it make it necessary for you to keep more Horses than before ?

Yes; during the Time I had the District I kept a Horse which I did not, and a Servant which, in consequence of giving up the District, I have left off keeping.

In fact you considered you were a Loser by the Contract?

I considered that keeping a Horse and Servant would cost me 50l. a Year.

That you have got rid of by giving up the District?

Yes

585 *What Distance had you to travel?*

The furthest Distance I had to go was Four Miles each Way from my House; from one Corner of my District to the other was about Eight Miles.

Can you give any Idea of the Number of Cases weekly you had in that District ?

I think, as nearly as I can give it, I had about Sixty or Seventy in the Quarter; in One Quarter I had about Ninety

There was some epidemic Disorder prevailing, probably in the Quarter in which you had Ninety ?

Yes, there was.

You were one of the Parties who signed a Letter to the Chairman of the Board of Guardians on the 2d of June 1837?

Yes; I believe it was that Day.

You signed also a Second Letter of the 6th of June?

I believe I did.

Did you at any Time after that offer to take the District?

Yes, I offered at the Sum of 40l.

The same District ?

Yes.

When was that ?

It was after writing the First and Second Letters.

Was that about the 16th of June ?

I think it was, or between the 16th and 24th.

Did you attend when the Election took place afterwards of Medical Officers ?

No, I did not; for I was told my Tender was refused.

Who has your District now?

Mr. Young.

At what Salary?

At 35l. a Year.

Where does he reside ?

He resides about Six Miles from me.

How far has he to travel to Parts of the District ?

The nearest Parish to him is about Four Miles, and the farthest Distance he has to go about Eleven Miles from his House.

If it did not answer to you, living within the District, and having only Four Miles to travel to the Extent of it, how can it possibly answer to Mr. Young ?

It would answer better to him, because few People who were not very ill would go to his House. They would prefer buying the Medicine, and taking their Chance without. It is an aguish District; and there is a Shop in the Neighbourhood where they can buy Ague Powders; and they prefer doing this to going to the Doctor. They can get enough Ague Powders for 1s. ; and if they had to go to the Doctor it would take Half a Day's Work.

You think it would answer better to a Medical Man living further off than to you who live in the Neighbourhood?

That is always the Case.

There would be less Medical Relief, then, given to the Poor?

Yes. I imagine it will be found that Mr. Young has not attended so many Cases in the Twelvemonth he has had it.

Did you speak to your own Knowledge of there having been so much Sickness as during your Year?

I should think much about the same.

You have other Patients ?

Yes.

586 *Can you speak to the general Health of the District?*

Yes; I think it was about the same.

Was not there the Influenza in the Year you attended?

Yes; in one Quarter of the Year there were more Cases in consequence; but that was One Quarter only ; I think the Quarter from December to the 25th of March.

That is the Reason you suppose Mr. Young may make it answer when you cannot?

Yes; they would come to me for more trifling Cases, I believe, for almost every Thing, because I live in the Neighbourhood.

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

17

Is Mr. Young a young Man?

Yes.

Just come into Practice

Yes.

How long have you been in Practice?

About Seven Years.

*Were you induced to take this as an Introduction
in the Profession ?*

I had some of the Parishes under the old Law, but there was One more joined, and I thought I would take it for One Year. I believe the Chairman of the Board of Guardians made use of the Expression that it was a Year of Probation, and we should see afterwards how we got on.

At the End of the Year of Probation did he consult you as to your Expense, and how far the Salary was sufficient?

We understood they were going to give the same Salaries; but we wrote a Letter to the Board stating that we could not do it for the Salaries we had received.

That was after the Advertisement, was not it?

I think it was. They asked us, I believe, first of all, about the Alteration of the Districts, and then they altered the Districts, and then wrote their Terms against each District; and we considered they were not sufficient.

They did not consult you about the Terms ?

No ; they asked us about the Alterations; what we thought would be convenient.

They did not ask you about the Salary, or give you an Opportunity of stating what you felt upon that Subject?

No, not till we wrote.

Did you attend afterwards a Meeting of professional Men residing in the Town and Neighbourhood ?

Yes, I did.

Was that held before or after the Elections had taken place ?

I think it was held before the Elections took place.

At the Time you refused to take the District at that Price was there any Association then formed of the Medical Profession in Bridgwater and the Neighbourhood?

At the Time I wrote the First Letter, stating our Opinion that our Salaries were not enough, there was not then an Association formed.

The Association was formed after you wrote that Letter?

Yes.

Did you ever make an Offer of taking them by the Head?

I believe I did.

At how much per Head ?

At 3³/₄d

What Salary would that have given you ?

That would have brought it to 40l. a Year.

587 *Did you continue to attend the Poor upon the Terms of being paid as for Mr.J. Addison. other Patients?*

I did.

Had you a Bill then brought in to the Guardians?

I had.

You had previously offered to attend the Poor gratuitously, had not you ?

I had.

Was that Bill paid to you?

It was.

Before the Trials took place, or afterwards ?

Before.

What was that ?

1l. 2s. 6d. ; it was not quite a Week I attended.

What District did you attend for that?

Middlezoy District.

Supposing you had taken that District at 40l. a Year, would you have had any Profit upon it after paying the Expense of the Drugs and your Horse Keep ?

Certainly not. I laid down my Horse for the Purpose of trying by Experiment what it cost me for attending; I found I could see my own Patients just as well without a Horse, and consequently my Horse was an Expense, in consequence of which he was put down.

In point of fact, if you had taken it at 40l. a Year, would not that have introduced you to other Practice?

No; I might perhaps have had a little extra Practice, and attended a few more which I do not attend now.

What made you fix on 3³/₄d, a Head as the Tender to be made for that District ?

The Reason was, it was less than others; but I considered that perhaps there were not so many Paupers in the District as some of the others; that I had not quite so much Trouble, perhaps, as I lived in a Country District.

Do you know the Number of Cases you attended in the course of the Year?

I should think it averaged Sixty or Seventy Cases in the course of a Quarter of a Year; in the course of the whole Year it would be from 240 to 280

Did you go several Times to the same Person in more than One Case?

Yes, during One Illness of that Person. A Man may be ill for a Month, or perhaps a whole Year.

That would be only one 4d. ?

Yes; it would be more.

Supposing the Man was ill for the whole Year, and you continued to attend him; that you would call only One Illness?

It would be Four Cases, for there would be Four different Quarters. We draw a Line across the Quarter, and commence again.

What do you consider to be the Average Expense incurred for Medicines in each Case ? -

I have calculated my Drugs at about 10l. for the Paupers for the whole Year. I did not keep any Account of them.

You speak of the prime Cost?

The Cost I pay at the Druggist's for them.

Then there is your Servant and Horse?

Yes; and I calculate that I cannot keep a Horse and a Servant, and pay the Tax, under 50l. a Year.

588 *And the Gentleman who has taken it at 35l. you say lives further off?*

Yes; I lived in the Centre of the Parishes, and the furthest I had from me was Four Miles; the nearest he has to him is Four Miles; the furthest Distance he has to go is Eleven Miles.

You say in consequence of his Distance many Persons who sent to you will not send to him?

Yes; they either get something for themselves, or wait till they get so bad they are obliged to send.

Is it not an Object that Medical Men should be as near as possible?

Yes; sometimes they are old People, a Man and his Wife, and have nobody to send for the Medicines.

You would consider it a great Inconvenience for a Medical Man to be at the Distance of Ten Miles ?

Yes.

And in case of sudden Attacks of Illness particularly?

Yes; it is necessary to see a Man as soon as possible, in some Cases.

A Man may be dead if there is a Delay of Two Hours?

Yes, it is possible.

Would it not have been an Advantage to have had you rather for the Benefit of the Poor than to have had a Gentleman at such Distance?

It would have been, certainly.

Do you know of any Cases where they have suffered by the Change?

I believe they have done pretty well. I have had Three or Four of them who have come to me to ask me to give them Medicines, and that they would pay me for them; but I have refused, saying they had better at once apply; that they would be obliged to apply at last. I have in some Cases given them a little Ointment, and so forth.

Do the poor Persons send for their Medicines, at whatever Distance they may reside?

Yes.

So that, in the Case of this Gentleman, who has to travel Seven or Eight Miles, they have that Distance to send for their Medicines?

Yes, some of them have ; and some more, and some less.

What is the Average ?

I should say Six Miles.

How is a single Man to send out for his Medicine?

He must get a Lad or a Neighbour's Child.

And pay for that Assistance?

I cannot say whether he would have to pay for that Assistance.

Is it a healthy District?

No, it is not a healthy District; it is an aguish District. There are Rheumatic Complaints about which require Attention.

It is a damp District ?

Yes.

Is Typhus or Diarrhoea prevalent?

No, not much ; the Population is not very thick. Sometimes there are Cases of Scarlet Fever raging in the Parishes.

Is there not a great deal of stagnant Water in the Ditches?

There is a great deal of stagnant Water about.

Had the poor Man, under the former Poor Law, to send as far for his Medicines as under the new Law ?

I was the Medical Man for Three Parishes before. The other Parish had only to send Four Miles, which was to Bridgwater. The furthest any had to send was Four Miles. The other Three Parishes I was Three Miles and a Half from. I lived between Three of the Parishes; they join together.

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

19

589 *Did you attend them by Contract under the old Poor Law ?*

Three of the Parishes.

What was your Salary for those Three ?

I think the Salary was 7l.7s. and 6l. 6s. and 5l.; 18l. for the Three. All our Parishes were let out then; we had what we called suspended Orders, which made a great Difference. It amounted to rather more, very often. I had Bills on some of the Parishes for attending the Paupers; now we attend all the Paupers living in the District, to whatever Parish they belonged.

The suspended Orders were for those belonging to other Parishes?

Yes; they would sometimes ask me to attend a Pauper belonging to another Parish, and pay me for it.

Generally the suspended Orders were looked on as a profitable Source of Income ?

Yes; we charged for them as private Patients.

But the Care and Attention was not greater than you bestowed on other Paupers?

No ; we pay as much Attention to the poor as to the rich, for our own Credit's Sake.

What were the Parishes you attended under the old Poor ?

Middlezoy, Othery, and Lyng;
Westonzoyland some Bridgwater Surgeon had, being near.

What did he get for that?

I do not know.

What is the Population of Westonzoyland ?

I should think about 1,000.

You attended Parishes containing 1,560 for 18l. ?

Yes, about 19l. ; then I had besides that any suspended Orders. They came to sometimes more sometimes less than the others; sometimes a suspended Order in One Case will amount to 10l. alone. It was generally rather more. I considered, taking the Four Parishes with those suspended Orders, they would average Forty Guineas a Year.

You know nothing of the Workhouse ?

No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

GEORGE WARRY Esquire is called in, and examined as follows:

YOU are Chairman of the Board of Guardians of the Bridgwater Union ?

I was Chairman from the Formation of the Union to the End of the Second Parochial Year, which ended on 25th March last. I am not the Chairman now.

In the course of last Summer, in the Months of June and July, you had some Difficulty about the letting of the Medical Districts; had you not ?

Yes.

Will you turn to Page 60 of the Papers shown you; is the Statement of the different Districts correct for the Year beginning June 1836 and ending June 1837?

I think it is ; but I have a Copy from the Minute Book. It appears to be correct, except that I see Cannington was 40l.

When was that let?

I have the Report of the Committee that was appointed at the Commence of the Union. That Committee was appointed on the 12th of May, and on the next Board Day after that they made their Report. On reference to the Minute Book, the Sum for Cannington appears to be 40l. a Year.

590 *Stowey District consisted of Four Parishes?*

It did; Nether Stowey, Over Stowey, Asholt, and Fiddington.

When those Districts were let at those Sums, was there any thing said to the Medical Persons that this would be taken as the Letting for the Year, and you would see by the Experience of the Year how far those Salaries were sufficient for the Purpose?

I have no Recollection that that was stated at the Board. I think that such an Expression as that has fallen from me from Time to Time in the course of the Year.

You are not aware of that having been said at the Board at the Time?

No ; I cannot charge my Memory with it.

Can you say that it was not used?

I do not know that I can speak positively one Way or another to that.

If it fell from you it would be a private Conversation between you and those Gentlemen, and not as the Organ of the Board?

I think I may positively say that no Authority for that came from the Board; that has been my Feeling.

You never delivered such an Opinion as the Organ of the Board from the Chair ?

I have no Recollection of it.

Did you privately ?

Yes; I think in communication with Mr. Toogood, who is my Medical Man, I may have said that was my Feeling. We had no Workhouse at that Time.

Did you ever say so to Mr. Abraham King?

I cannot remember having had any Communication with him upon the Subject.

Was whatever you said with a view to the better Adjustment of the Salaries, or the Increase of them

I should say the better Adjustment with reference to the Paupers which each of the Medical Men was to attend to ; for as soon as our Workhouse was built I contemplated that the infirm would be brought into the Workhouse when the Parish Houses were disposed of, as they would be, under the new Law. In case of Casualties there would be no Place into which a Parish Officer could remove them; but such Cases must of Necessity be brought into the Workhouse, and in consequence be taken off the Hands of the Surgeon of the District; which Case actually happened in my own Parish; a Casualty did occur, and the Man was taken to Bridgwater Workhouse. Thereby the Medical Officer's Labours in the District would be diminished.

At the End of the Year you determined to divide the Districts differently?

Yes.

You directed the Medical Officers to attend the Board?

Yes.

When they attended the Board did you consult them as to the Division of the Districts, and also as to the Salaries ?

We consulted them as to their Districts, but I think nothing was said as to their Salaries; but previous to that a Circular had been sent to all the Medical Men, I think, with a Fortnight's Notice. I can read the Letter sent by Direction of the Board. On the 5th of May 1837 there was a Letter dated " Bridgwater Union.—Sir, By Direction of the Board I send you, on the other Side, a Copy of the proposed Districts for Medical Relief, together with a Resolution of the Board thereon, to which I beg to call your immediate Attention, and to request that you will be pleased to attend personally before the Board on the 18th Instant at Ten o'Clock in the Forenoon, to give such Information as the Guardians may require." In that Letter was enclosed a Document which had been sent to the Board by a Medical Gentleman of the Town of Bridgwater, Mr. Henry Axford. I have a Copy of that Paper before me.

591 *Is that a new Division ? -*

It is a Suggestion of Mr. Axford, a Surgeon of Bridgwater.

Did you follow those Suggestions?

No.

When they came on the 18th of May, you had not made up your Minds exactly as to the Division of Districts, nor as to the Salaries you meant to give in each Case.?

No. The 18th of May was not a Board Day, but a Day set apart for the Consideration of this Subject; it was a Thursday.

Nothing was said by the Medical Officers in respect of the Salaries you pro posed to give ?

No, not on Money Matters; the Question was put to them, and repeated over and over again, whether or not they had any thing to state which it would be useful for the Board to know previously to coming to the Arrangements for the ensuing Year.

The geographical Arrangements only ?

The Arrangements generally. I do not think it was confined to that.

Did not Mr. King begin to state something about the Convenience of the Bridgwater District being the same as that for Registration ?

Yes, I think he did. I thought he was about to state something which did not appear relevant, and I stated to him that that Subject we were not about to consider now.

You considered that the Question of Registration should be kept distinct from and subordinate to the Medical Relief?

Quite so.

You put out an Advertisement on the 22d of May?

After the Medical Men left the Board the Guardians took into consideration the Subject, and proceeded to divide the Districts and to fix the Salaries.

You subsequently received a Letter from the Gentlemen who had had the Districts the preceding Year, declining to take the Districts at those Salaries?

Yes.

Upon that what Steps did you take?

That Letter was received at the Board; it is dated, I think, on the 2d of June, and it was received very soon after. That Letter came so much upon us by Surprise that individual Members of the Board certainly expressed some strong Feelings upon it. I should first of all state that on the 18th of May, which was the last of the Days set apart for the Arrangement of the Union into Districts, we came to the Resolutions contained in our Advertisement of the 22d of May. The next Day was a Board Day, the 19th of May; we heard nothing then of any Dissatisfaction on the Part of the Medical Men, or of any

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589

Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

Friends of theirs at the Board, with those Arrangements, or the Salaries which the Board had fixed for them. I think on the 24th of May, that was on a Wednesday, I happened to meet an influential Medical Gentleman of Bridgwater in Company, and a Conversation then passed between us respecting our Arrangements for the ensuing Year; he said nothing to me about the Salary.

Who was that Gentleman ?

Mr. Jonathan Toogood. I recollect perfectly well his saying to me, "You are now about to appoint fresh Medical Officers. I would suggest to you the Propriety of having only duly qualified Men; Men who are Members of the College of Surgeons, and also Licentiates of the Apothecaries Company." The Suggestion appeared to me a very reasonable one; and as I was always anxious the Poor should have the very best Advice we could get for them, I assented to the Reasonableness of his Proposition. This was in private, I think on the Wednesday.

Had any of your Doctors been Persons not so qualified ?

Yes; as I understood, One of our Medical Officers was not qualified according to that Scale Mr. Toogood then proposed. The Board Day following this Conversation, in the course 592 of the Proceedings of the Day, which was the Second Board Day after we made our Arrangements on the 18th of May, a Gentleman, a Member of our Board, got up in the course of the Morning, and submitted to the Board the following Resolution; that is, on Friday the 26th of May. It was moved by the Rev. N. Ruddock, and seconded by R. K. M. King, Esq., "That no Gentleman, who is not at present a Medical Officer under this Union be eligible to fill that Situation unless he has passed his Examination at the Apothecaries Hall, and is also a Member of the College of Surgeons;" which Motion, on a Division, was negatived. When this Motion came before the Board it immediately occurred to my Mind that it was exactly that which had been proposed to myself a few Days before. I rather countenanced the Thing, and it so happened that I had conceived the Majority had come to the Resolution; however, a Gentleman sitting at the Bottom of the Table questioned my Decision, and I called for a Show of Hands; and I think in the meantime a Guardian of One of the Parishes was rather anxious about it, and having called the Attention of the other Members of the Board to it, made them more alive to it. In the Result the Motion was rejected by a Majority of One or Two. I would beg to state what would have been the Effect if it had been carried : it would

have allowed Mr. Addison to become a Candidate; but it would have prevented Mr. Young, who was a Candidate for the Hill District, from being a Candidate, because he was a Member of the College of Surgeons, but not a Licentiate of the Apothecaries Company. Mr. Addison, on the other hand, I believe, is a Licentiate of the Apothecaries Company, but not a Member of the College of Surgeons. Now, looking at the Instance of Mr. Young; he resides at Ashcott, in the Hill District. We divided No. 3. District into Two, in consequence of a Representation to the Board. On the 21st of April the following Communication was addressed to the Guardians: "Ashcott,

18th April 1837.-Gentlemen, We, the Churchwardens, Overseers, and Inhabitants whose Names are hereunto annexed, beg leave to call your Attention to the great Inconvenience and Hardship imposed on the Poor in consequence of the Medical Officer not residing in the District, but at a Distance exceeding Ten Miles from the extreme and about Three Miles from the nearest Point;" that was Mr. Baruch Toogood. "As there is One if not more Medical Gentlemen residing in and contributing to the Support of the District, of unexceptionable Character and Qualifications, willing to undertake the Office on equal Terms as at present held, we presume to suggest to your Board the Propriety and Justice of appointing One of them at the earliest Opportunity. We are actuated entirely by a Sense of Duty, and from an Understanding that it is the Wish of the Poor Law Commissioners that the Medical Officer should reside within the District. We are your most obedient Servants." Signed by the Parish Officers and Nine Inhabitants of Ashcott; by the Four other Inhabitants of Shapwick; by the Curate and Two principal Farmers of Grenton; by the Overseer of Sutton. Mr. Baruch Toogood, who had the Care of this District, was residing in Bridgwater. In consequence of this Address from those several Parishes, having found this was a most inconvenient Arrangement we had come to the previous Year, from Mr. Toogood being so distant from that Part of the District, and inasmuch as Mr. Young had in the course of the Year come to reside at Ashcott, Attention was immediately called to the Fact, and he was looked on as a Person well qualified to take care of the District.

He would have been excluded if that Measure had been carried ?

Yes. I was not in the least aware, at the Time the Motion was made, that he was not a Member of the Apothecaries Company, nor was Mr. Mead King, who seconded the Motion. When we divided that District into Two, I think it was with reference to him ; and we had in view the giving Mr. Baruch Toogood the Polden District, nearer his own House, so as to retain him in the Establishment; and thus we should

have the Benefit of Mr. Young's Services at Ashcott close to the Spot where he resided, and Mr. Baruch Toogood nearer his District. Mr. Young had had Correspondence with the Poor Law Commissioners upon the Subject, and had previously sent his Letter to the Board on the Subject, stating that he was a proper Person to be appointed. That Motion was negatived; but nothing at that Board was said with regard to the Salaries of the Officers.

593 *The Board thought it unjust to exclude one Member and to retain another who had not the Qualifications which were thought essential ?*

I suppose so; but after the Resolution was negatived the Matter dropped, and no Discussion took place upon it. The Gentleman active in defeating this was the Guardian for Ashcott Parish ; but I was not at all aware of Mr. Young not being a Member of the College of Surgeons, or I should not have sanctioned it.

You live at Ashcott ?

I live at Shapwick.

Does Mr. Young attend your Family ?

He does.

The Guardian of the Poor for Ashcott was desirous of securing the Services for the Poor of a Man living in that Neighbourhood?

Yes; and there was a strong Feeling of that Sort expressed at the Commencement of our Union, when we elected Mr. Baruch Toogood, because he was a Candidate for the No. 3. District when the Union was formed.

Mr. Baruch Toogood is the Son of the Gentleman with whom you had Conversation upon this Subject?

Yes. On the 31st of May 1836, when we were electing the Medical Officers, it was moved and seconded, "That, Mr. Baruch Toogood be appointed the Medical Officer for District No. 3., with a Salary of 50l." To this Motion an Amendment was moved and seconded, "That Mr. Hugh Williams be appointed Medical Officer for the said District No. 3." Upon a Division Mr. Baruch Toogood was declared duly elected. He was opposed then, but the Qualifications of Mr. Williams, who resides at Ashcott, were not considered as satisfactory, and therefore he was not taken. Mr. Baruch Toogood is well qualified; and as he undertook to establish a Sort of Dispensary in his District, to hire a Lodging, and be there Two Days a Week, he was elected.

Mr. Hugh Williams was considered not as a well-qualified Person ?

No; he had no Testimonials. -

You have not in all Cases adhered to the Rule of taking a Person living close in preference to a Person living at a Distance; have you? Mr. Addison lived near the District now filled by another Gentleman ?

Yes, he did.

Why was he passed over ?

He refused to accept the Appointment the Second Year. We should have been very glad if he would have taken the District.

At 35l.?

Yes,

On the 22d of May 1837 you put out an Advertisement stating the Alteration of Districts and the Alteration of Salaries ?

Yes.

Shortly after that, on the 2d of June, you received a Letter from the Medical Gentlemen that had been in charge of the Districts the Year before, declining to take the Districts at the low Salaries?

Yes, we did.

What Steps did you take to fill those Appointments?

This Letter was produced to the Board, and was read immediately after I had taken my Seat at the Board. It came upon me quite by Surprise, as Two Board Days had elapsed since we made the Arrangement, and no Medical Officers had communicated to the Board their Dissatisfaction of the Terms, and no Friend of theirs at the Board had mentioned the Subject of Salaries, and as the Appointment of Medical Officers had been before the Board on the previous Day by the Motion to which I have referred, which had the Appearance, as we thought, of confining the Choice to the Medical Officers of the past Year, inasmuch as it would prevent the Appointment of one who might interfere who might not come within the Definition of "duly qualified;" and we certainly did not wish that any but a qualified Man should be chosen. Upon the **594** reading of this Letter a great deal of Conversation passed between different Members of the Board, and each gave their Opinions respecting it: some said it was a Combination, and some Altercation took place between different Members of the Board respecting it. After some Time, I suggested to the Board, that as they had on the 18th of May fixed the Consideration of the Subject for the 16th of June, and for hearing of the Medical Officers, it would be better, perhaps, to let the Matter stand over till the 16th of June, when the Subject would come before the Board, and that we should not then proceed further on the Consideration. The Board adopted that View, and the Matter dropped.

Did you acknowledge the Receipt of that Letter?

No, I think not; but just as the Matter dropped I rose from my Seat and said, "Now,

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589
Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

23

Gentlemen, there is One Request I have to make: some angry Words and some Expressions have been made use of, which it would be should not be known beyond this Board Room; and I have therefore to request, in order to prevent any Collision or Ill-will among ourselves and the Medical Officers, that not a Word of this may transpire beyond this Room." Up rose a Guardian, and protested against any such Doctrine from the Chair. He said that he was the Representative there of a Population of between 8,000 and 9,000, and he claimed for himself the Right of making known every thing that transpired, and he should exercise that Right.

Who was that Gentleman ?

Mr. Bowen.

What Parish did he represent?

Bridgwater.

Was any thing more done on that Day ?

No, nothing more that Day; no further Notice was taken. It was understood that the Consideration of this Letter of the Medical Officers would come on On the 16th.

It was dated on the 7th?

It was dated on the 2d.

Did not you think that some Acknowledgment of that Letter should be made in the meantime, stating that the Board meant that it should be taken into consideration on the 16th ?

It was perhaps more an Oversight than any thing else; our Business at the Board has occupied a great deal of Time. As soon as this Matter dropped We proceeded to other Business.

There was a good deal of Altercation ?

Yes. The Letter did not appear to call for an Answer; it might have been respectful to have acknowledged it, and if that had occurred to us the Clerk would have been directed to acknowledge it.

Was anything done the next Board Day; was it directed to be acknowledged?

Yes. It came backed with the Signatures of all the Medical Men of the District; it appeared to carry the Import of a Threat; the Board was rather displeased with it.

The Object of the Letter was merely to state that they could not perform those Duties at those Salaries?

It was.

It was more displeasing to the Board on account of its being in Reality a Surprise to them?

It was.

In none of the Conversations you had had, had any Opinion been expressed by the Medical Men to you that the Salaries were inadequate ?

No.

Had you never any Conversation with any Medical Persons during the Year, who complained that their Salaries were inadequate ?

I think I might. I think, generally speaking, no Medical Men are satisfied with the Salaries they receive.

595 *Was it your Impression that they all considered themselves under-paid?*

They might have stated that to me; and my Impression is that a Communication of that Sort had passed.

Then why should it come so much by Surprise upon you when your Proposal was a Reduction of Salaries ?

No ; it was rather an Increase the Second Year by 12l.

In some Cases there was a Decrease, was there not?

There was some slight Alteration.

Why should it take you by Surprise, if you understood they were dissatisfied with their Salaries in the meantime ?

Because Two Board Days had passed, and they had expressed no Feeling that they were not properly paid. On Mr. Ruddock's Motion that would have been the Time to have mentioned something as to the Salaries fixed on the previous Thursday.

Were any of those Medical Gentlemen present when you expected something should be said?

No, certainly not.

Had the Guardians, during the First Year of Office, expressed the Idea that the Medical Men were under-paid, or was it made the Subject of Conversation at the Board ?

I cannot charge my Recollection with any thing of the Kind having passed at the Board.

You sent no Answer after the First Board Day; did you send an Answer the next Board Day ?

Yes. Another Letter was received, dated the 6th of June, and addressed to the Chairman, which was printed and circulated in the Neighbourhood about Two Days before the next Board Day; and about Two Days before I got the Original, it was sent round to the Guardians. It was printed Two Days before it was brought to me; I did not receive it till the 9th.

Have you got a Copy of it?

I have.

Day 2 Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589

Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

24

They did not send you a printed Copy?

No ; I was in Bridgwater on the Market Day, the Thursday, and heard from the Clerk that a Letter was in circulation in Print, and a Guardian told me he had received it the Night before by Post. The Guardian of my own Parish had received this Letter on the Wednesday before the Board Day, but I was not acquainted with its Contents till the Board Day.

Is it to that printed Letter you sent a courteous Reply on the next Board Day?

It is. The Letter we sent on the 9th was an Answer to both Letters; I think it was an apologetic Letter, stating that we did not mean any Disrespect by not answering their first.

Did you after that receive any Tenders from any Medical Officers to take the Districts ?

The 16th of June came, the Day we had fixed on the 18th of May for the Election; that Day having arrived the Business of the Day came on in course. I think that the Communications were then read to the Board, the various Letters; and also the Letter of Ashcott Parish was read; their Remonstrance complaining of the Distance of Mr. Baruch Toogood from that Parish.

Had you received any Offers from those Gentlemen of taking the Districts at so much a Head?

Not before the 16th of June, I think; but on the 16th of June there was some Offer made.

What Offers were made then ?

The Offer on the 16th of June was this: "Sir, - The undersigned Medical Gentlemen beg respectfully to inform the Board of Guardians, that they are willing to undertake the Care of the Poor on fair and equitable Terms, although they cannot accept the Offer contained 596 in the Circular Letter addressed to them. They beg to direct the Attention of the Board to the Fact, that the Average Payment on the Population in the Bridgwater Union is considerably lower than in others." That is signed by all the Medical Officers.

Was there no Offer of taking Nos. 26. 27. and 28. at 4d. a Head?

No.

That is stated to be on the 16th of June ?

No ; that is a Mistake of the Pamphlet; that was on the 23d or 24th of June.

Have you that Offer here?

I have the separate Offers of the Medical Men; they made separate Offers.

Was that before the Election ?

We had no Election on the 23d of June; we filled up Two of the Offices on the 16th, and advertised again for Medical Officers to appear

at the next Board Day, which was the 23d ; this was dated the 22d.

Which Two were filled up on the 16th?

The Polden and the Hill District.

It was then moved and carried, that the Appointment of the remaining Medical Officers be postponed till this Day Week; and the Clerk was directed to advertise by Handbills ?

Yes. Mr. Young was elected on the 16th ; after he had left the Room he came back to complain of Ill-treatment he had received from the Medical Men for accepting the Appointment which he had done; that appears upon the Minutes. "It being made known that Mr. Robert Young was desirous of being again admitted to the Board, he was called in, and stated, that in consequence of a Meeting that had been held by the professional Gentlemen in Bridgwater, at which they had passed a Resolution, that any Medical Men accepting Office under the existing Salaries should be considered as Enemies to the Profession in general, and that such should be treated by their Body as hostile to the Profession, and he having accepted the Office of Medical Officer to the Hill District, he had been treated in a most ungentlemanly and insulting Manner by several of the Medical Officers, and told by the Party that what ever his Difficulties might be they would render him no Assistance. He wished to be informed, if he should find it necessary to call in Assistance in the Execution of his Duties, if he might call in any Medical Gentleman he pleased from Taunton or any other neighbouring Town. The Board gave him to understand that they would protect him in the Discharge of his Duties, and that they would sanction his Ali. to his Assistance any Medical Gentleman he might think proper, should it be deemed necessary." -

Did he state to you who the Persons were who had insulted him ?

I forget whether he did then ; I do not think he did at the Board.

Which was his District ?

The Hill District.

What Salary had he ?

I think 35l. ; it was smaller than the Hill District the preceding Year; it had been divided.

Was the Sum of 35l. given him ?

That was the Salary which was agreed upon on the 18th of May. Previously to the 16th of June the Medical Officers had had a Meeting, and come to the Resolutions which they have printed in their Pamphlet. Mr. Young had been invited to that Meeting, which was held at the Hotel at Bridgwater on the 8th of June, by an anonymous Letter, and so had Mr. Phillips.

A printed Letter?

No, a written Letter.

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

Day 2, Tuesday 14 June 1838

Evidence of Robert Underdown, p 563; Abraham King 565; Joseph Addison, p 584; George Werry, p 589

Edited by Tony Woolrich 23/04/2021

25

Did you ever see that Letter?

I have Mr. Young's Letter; he gave it me; this is the Letter.

597 The same is read as follows:

"Sir A Meeting of the Medical Profession will be held at the Clarence Hotel, Bridgwater, on Thursday the 8th Instant, at One o'Clock, for the Purpose of taking into consideration the present Position of Medical Men as regards the Poor Law Bill. Bridgwater, 5th June 1837."

I hold in my Hand another Letter, which was handed over to me, addressed to the late Mr. Caswell, inviting him also to the Meeting.

That is not anonymous ?

No, it is not; it is signed by Mr. Baruch Toogood.

The same is read as follows:

'Bridgwater, 5th June. Sir, A Meeting of the Profession will be held at the Clarence Hotel in this Town at One o'Clock on Thursday next, for the Purpose of taking into consideration the Effect of the Poor Law Act on the Profession. The Favour of your Attendance is requested. I am, Sir, your obedient Servant, BARUCH Toogood.'

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, Twelve o'Clock.