

685

Die Martis, 19^o Junil 1838.

The Lord WHARNCLIFFE in the Chair.
Evidence on the Operation of the Poor Law
Amendment Act.

RICHARD KING MEADE KING Esquire is
called in, and examined as follows:

WHERE do you reside?

At North Petherton near Bridgwater.

*You have been Vice Chairman of the Bridgwater
Union ?*

Yes, the first Year of its Formation, from 1836
to 1837. I think the Union was formed in May. I
was Vice Chairman from its Formation to Lady
Day 1837.

*Since Lady Day 1837 have you remained a
Guardian of the Union ?*

Yes. I was ex officio Guardian, and am so
still.

Have you attended constantly ?

I have attended the great Majority of
Meetings.

*When you were the Vice Chairman were you an
elected Guardian ?*

I was first of all an elected Guardian,

*You have had considerable Differences at your
Board upon several Subjects, and especially upon the
Subject of the Remuneration to the Medical Officers
of the Board ?*

Yes; in the Year 1837 we had.

*In the Year 1836 you let the different Districts to
certain Gentlemen at Rates fixed by yourselves ?*

Yes.

*Was there, at the Time of that letting, any
Conversation with Persons privately, or with the
Board of Guardians publicly, on the Subject of the }.
of the Remuneration, and the Prospect of their being
better paid another Year ?*

No, not at the Time of the Formation of the
Union. I heard nothing about an Insufficiency of
Pay for many Months after the Union had been
formed; and then, in various private
Conversations with different Medical Men, I
heard some of them say they were insufficiently
paid.

*Do you mean different Medical Men who had
taken Districts, or the Medical Men in general ?*

I think the Medical Men in general; some of
them expressed themselves as being well paid;
but I think I certainly heard Complaints from
One or Two, of the Insufficiency of their
Remuneration.

*Can you distinguish those who thought they were
well paid from those who were dissatisfied ?*

I think I heard Mr. Addison of Burrow
Bridge say that he had no Fault to find with the
Remuneration; but I am not perfectly certain of
the Names. I think he for one expressed himself
to be sufficiently remunerated; and I heard the
Guardian of his Parish say that he was
remunerated in a much higher Proportion than
he had been under the old System.

Can you mention any others?

No, I do not think I can.

686

*Can you mention, on the other hand, those who
have expressed themselves dissatisfied ?*

Mr. Tilsley, the Medical Man of my own
Parish of North Petherton. About the Close of
the first Year of his Contract I heard him and
likewise his Partner state that he was not
sufficiently remunerated.

*On what Principle did you fix those Salaries in
the first instance ?*

**A Committee was formed for the Purpose of
endeavouring to arrange the Medical Districts
and the Salaries, and I was one of the
Committee. We expressed ourselves perfectly
in the Dark on the Subject of Medical
Remuneration. Mr. Weale being present, we
asked whether he could give us any Guide; he
said in the Unions he had formed in West
Somerset he found that about 3d. a Head on
the gross Population would be sufficient
Remuneration, except in Districts densely
populated, as in Towns, and there he thought
2½d. sufficient. It was on that }. we received
that we laid down the Remuneration. It was all
new to us.**

2½d. where the Population was dense ?

Yes; he said he had found that sufficient in
other Places.

*Did he raise it above 8d. in some Cases where the
Population was extremely scattered ?*

**Yes; in some of our Districts we gave a
Trifle above 8d. ; but I think he said from 2½d,
where it was very dense to 8d. I think we
offered 3½d. or 3d. where it was very scattered.
In North Petherton, the largest Agricultural
Parish in the Union, I think it was as nearly as
possible 3d, a Head.**

*Were you cognizant of the Chairman of the Board
or any Member of the Board holding out to those
Gentlemen that it was a mere temporary*

Arrangement, and that they would probably be better paid next Year, by means of Medical Clubs, or otherwise ?

No, not exactly that; there was an Understanding, certainly, that the first was a Year of Probation, and that the Guardians on the one Hand and the Medical Men on the other would be better Judges of what was a fit Remuneration another Year: we were all somewhat in the Dark.

Both Parties were at liberty to suggest any Alteration in the Division of the Districts ?

Yes. With respect to the Medical Men, next Year their Opinions were asked respecting the Division of the Districts, and they were requested to make any Suggestions.

During the first Year had you any Reason to complain of the Conduct of any of the Medical Officers ?

No, I think not; I have no Recollection of the Kind.

In the ensuing Year did that Committee sit again upon the Subject of the Salaries and the Divisions of the Districts ?

I think there was a Committee formed the ensuing Year, but I was not a Member of it.

You had a Meeting on the 18th of May 1837, had not you, at which the Medical Officers were requested to attend?

We had.

Upon that Occasion you consulted the Medical Officers in respect to the Division of the Districts, but not with respect to the Salaries?

I have no distinct Recollection of being present, but if I was my Name will appear on the Minutes.

[It appears from the Minute Book that the Witness was not present].

Do you know how far the Medical Officers were consulted with respect either to the Division of the Districts or to their Salaries?

No ; because I was not a Member of the Committee in the Year 1837, and was not present on the 18th of May, when they attended the Board.

687

On what Principle did you fix the new Salaries in 1837?

I really do not know on what Principle the Committee fixed them. It was done I believe entirely by the Committee.

You in point of fact knew nothing of the Salaries

that were to be given to each of those Medical Officers for the several Districts before you saw the Advertisement on the 22d of May?

I did not; that was the first Information I had. I thought some of the Sums mentioned there were rather too low when I read the Advertisement.

Upon what Principle did you think them too low?

Did you think the former Proportions of 2%^d. on the Population in the more populous Parts, and from 3d. to 3%^d. in the others, was too low, or was it that you thought that 8d. per Head was too low for that Population ?

I looked more particularly to my own District of North Petherton. I found that the Sum proposed to be given was 55l. ; I calculated what that would be per Head, and found it was only about 2¾^d., which was a Farthing under the 3d. a Head which Mr. Weale recommended us to give; and from the Observations I had made, and knowing pretty well the Duties Mr. Tilsley had to perform, I thought 8d. a Head rather too low. I attended more to my own District than the others, and I was surprised to find that so low a Sum was proposed.

Did you attend the Board on the 2d of June ?

Yes, I did.

Upon that Occasion there was a Letter produced from the Medical Officers?

Yes; a Letter was brought into the Room.

Is that the Letter on Page 61 of the Papers laid before this Committee ?

Yes.

That was accompanied with an Addition or Recommendation of the other Medical Men of Bridgwater ?

It was.

When this was read to the Board of Guardians was the Result that there was a considerable Feeling excited in the Board by the reading it?

There certainly was, I believe upon that Occasion I suggested the Propriety of withdrawing the Advertisement of the 22d of May, and I stated as my Reason for doing so, that I thought the Remunerations proposed were too low, and that if the Board were satisfied they had done wrong in issuing that Advertisement the better Way was at once to withdraw the Advertisement, to prevent any unpleasant Feeling, which I thought likely to occur, between the Board and the Medical Men. The Board did not at all concur in my Suggestion, and one of the Guardians, an ex-officio Guardian, since dead, Mr. Poole, in particular replied to my Suggestion by saying

he thought that would show very vacillating Conduct in the Board, one Day to put forward an Advertisement and to withdraw it on the next ; and that he thought the best Way would be to wait till the 16th of June, and see what Tenders were given in, according to that Advertisement. I felt the Force of his Argument, and that the Adoption of my Suggestion would look like an Inconsistency in the Conduct of the Board, and I yielded. I found the general Feeling of the Board was against me, and I felt there was Ground for it, and from Respect to the Guardian who in particular took the View of the Matter which I have mentioned I withdrew my Proposition.

Were there any Remarks made upon the Terms of the Letter?

I think it was said that the Letter was not very courteously expressed; it was handed in, and nobody knew who brought it; it was just thrown upon the Table. Some of the Guardians said it was not very courteously addressed; that it appeared to be a very hasty Document, or Words to that Effect.

They could not mean that it was a hastily considered Document, inasmuch as it appeared that the Persons who signed the Document had got that Addition to it from their Brethren in Bridgwater?

I think some Observation was made that the Ink was scarcely dry; and it appeared in fact as

683

if it had been just written, and in haste. Some of the Guardians thought it was not well considered.

On looking at that Paper itself is there any thing in the Substance of the Letter, and the Manner in which it is expressed, which appears to you improper on the Part of those Gentlemen ?

No, I do not think there is ; but I was sorry to see the Letter, because I thought that if the Medical Men at the previous Meeting, when called before the Board, had stated verbally what they wrote, probably the original Advertisement never would have been issued. I was therefore very sorry myself to see the Letter come in.

In that Case it would have been necessary for the Board of Guardians to ask their Opinion on the Subject of the Salaries ?

Not being present at that Meeting I cannot say what took place, but I understood that the Medical Men were invited to give their Opinions on the Subject of the Salaries.

If they were not invited to give an Opinion on the Subject of the Salaries, but only of the Divisions, was it not very natural they should take some Step subsequently to the Advertisement, to give their Opinion on the Subject of the Salaries ?

Yes.

Have you not since understood that when they attempted to speak on the Subject of Salary they were checked ?

No. I have always understood that it was expected that if they had any Objection to make to the Salaries they would make it at that Time; that was the Feeling then, and has been ever since. I thought that if they had expressed their Feelings at the previous Meeting, they very probably would not have expressed that which they have by this Letter.

The following Resolution is read from the Minutes of the 5th of May:

The following Statement of a proposed Division of the Union into Districts for Medical Relief having been produced to the Board, and read, it was resolved, on the Motion of T. W. Inman, Esquire, and seconded by Mr. Francis Brice, That a Copy of the same be forwarded to each of the Medical Officers belonging to the Union, with a Request that they will, on or before Thursday next, forward to the Clerk any Remarks thereon that may appear to them to be useful, in order to assist the Board in their Consideration of this Subject.

On what Ground have you come to the Conclusion that they had been invited to give their Opinion on the Subject of the Salaries?

From what many of the Guardians told me. I think the Chairman, amongst the rest, and others, said the Board sat for the Purpose of hearing any Suggestions on the Subject of the Districts or Salaries. I can only speak from Hear say; that has been my Impression ever since.

Mr. Warry was the Chairman?

Yes.

Did he not tell you that he had stopped some Medical Man who was going on to speak of the Salaries?

I do not recollect his saying any thing of the Kind.

On the Receipt of the Letter was there anything said with respect to sending an Answer to it by the Board ?

No, I do not remember anything. I think I have stated what did take place; the Suggestion I made, and the Answer given by Mr. Poole, who is since dead. He said, "Let us wait and see the Result of the Advertisement on the 16th of June;" and I think there the Conversation

dropped. I did not make any Motion on the Subject, feeling the Board was against me.

Did you hear any Accusations of uncandid and improper Conduct on the Part of the Medical Officers?

I think several of the Guardians expressed a Wish that the Medical Men had stated that which they wrote, when they were called before the Board, on t^o previous Day, -Was

689

Was there any thing like strong Language, that this was scandalous Conduct, or any thing of that Sort?

No. I think nothing at all so strong as that, but more an Expression of Regret that the Medical Men had not thought fit to make the Statement on the Day previous, when they were called before the Board, which they then made in Writing.

Nothing was said about sending an Answer?

I do not remember any thing being said about sending an Answer.

Did it not appear to yourself that it would have been advisable to have taken some Notice of it?

I concluded that the Clerk would acknowledge the Receipt of the Letter, - which it seems he did not; for many Letters are received of which nothing is said, but which, in the usual Course, the Clerk acknowledges.

Does he acknowledge all the Letters he receives ?

He acknowledges the greatest Number, I conceive.

Would it not have been better for the Clerk to have answered this Letter, and to have said the Letter had been received, but that you did not think it right to make any Alteration until the 16th of June?

Certainly that was an Oversight on the Part of the Board; it would have been more courteous; but I can positively state that no Slight was intended by the Board towards the Medical Men.

Independent of the Courtesy, do you not think it would have been a much more likely Way to bring the Matter to a satisfactory Conclusion, if a Letter of that Kind had been written ?

I think it possible it might; we certainly ought to have directed an Answer, although I am sure the Board did not mean, in omitting so to do, to act discourteously; there was no Insult intended.

If such an Answer as that had been returned it would have been a Notice to the Gentlemen, not only that the Letter had been received, but that the Matter would be taken into consideration on a future Day ?

I am quite willing to confess we ought to have returned an Answer.

At the same Time that would not have pledged you to any particular Course?

We certainly should have answered the Letter; but I still beg leave to say I am sure the Board did not intend to convey an Insult to the Medical Men; it was an Oversight.

Was it at the next Meeting that the Letter of the 6th of June was received ?

Yes; it was at the Meeting on the 9th of June, I think, that Letter was read; but I received a Copy of it Two or Three Days before. It was printed and circulated, and a Copy sent me by the Post a Day or Two before the Meeting, and on the 9th of June the Letter was read.

In the first Paragraph they speak of having heard vague Reports of their having been charged with uncandid and improper Conduct. Had there been any thing in the Discussion in the Board that could warrant any body so to represent the Feelings exhibited on that Occasion by the Board ?

No. I think that is too strongly expressed; I do not think any Expressions imported that.

Was there any such Expression used at the Board as to imply that they considered the Parties guilty of Conspiracy or Combination ?

A good deal was talked about Combination, because it was understood that the Medical Men at Bridgwater had had a Meeting, which they called a Medical Association.

If that Expression was used would it not very naturally lead to those Parties thinking they had been charged with uncandid and improper Conduct?

I think it was on the Meeting of the 9th of June there was a Talk about Combination.

There was none on the 2d ?

No. I think the Meeting of the Medical Association did not take place till after the 2d.

690

Can you tell to what the Statement in that Paragraph refers?

- I dare say it may have referred to the Discussion which took place at the Board on the 2d of June; and most probably the Expressions, whatever the were, which were used, would come to the Medical Men, second or third hand a good deal magnified; but I think no Expressions were used implying uncivil or improper Conduct.

Was Mr. Weale present at that Meeting ?

No, I do not think he was.

Of course after the Receipt of that Letter of June 6th the Feelings of the Board of Guardians were more irritated than they had been before?

Yes, certainly.

And they probably used stronger Expressions after that than they had previously?

I think there were much stronger Expressions used after the Receipt of that Letter; and I think it was after the Receipt of that Letter some Conversation took place with respect to the Combination of the Medical Men.

To that Letter a Reply was given to the Board ?

Yes; a Reply which is printed.

It was written on the Day the Letter was received?

Yes.

There is one Paragraph in this Letter: "The Board cannot help lamenting the Tone of your Communications, little calculated to promote that cordial Co. operation with the Board on which the Well-being of the Poor and the Interests of all concerned so essentially depend." There was some Difference of Opinion in the Board on the Subject of that Paragraph, was there not?

It seems so, as printed here, but I have no Recollection of the Circumstance,

Was the Answer written at the Board ?

Yes; I remember it very well.

They do not usually state the Numbers on the Division ?

No ; and it was a Remark that somebody must have taken them down specially, for that they are never taken down in the Minute Book.

Was there a Division ?

I think it probable that there was, but I cannot recollect that there was.

In the Letter of the 6th of June those Medical Gentlemen tender their Services gratuitously till some other Arrangement can be made, provided such Arrangement can be perfected within a reasonable Period. The Answer to that acknowledges the Generosity of the Offer, but does not either accept or refuse it?

No.

What was meant to be done?

The Intention of the Board was, not to accept the Tender, in order that the Board might be perfectly unfettered; they did not wish to put themselves under further Obligations to the Medical Men.

Subsequently they were ordered to attend the Patients, and to charge as for private Patients ?

Yes.

On the 16th of June, which would be the next Board Day, were you present?

I was.

That was the Day which had been fixed for the Elections ?

Yes

On that Occasion the Board received some Letters containing Tenders from the Medical Officers ?

Yes, they did.

.691

Is this a correct Account of the Offer: "On the 16th of June they offered R. K. M. King, Esq. to take the Charge of the Districts marked 2, 6, 7, 8, at 4d. a Head, No. 5. — at 8: #d., and the Bridgwater District at 3d., on the gross Population of 1832; and the Union House, which is intended to contain 800 People, at 50l. a Year" ?

Yes, I believe there was some Offer of the Sort, and each of them wrote Letters.

When those Letters were received, was there any Discussion in the Board respecting them ?

Yes; a great deal of Discussion took place, and particularly on the Subject of the Meeting of the Medical Men. Then I believe it was called a Combination, where they had pledged themselves not to accept any Appointment under the Board without the Sanction of a Committee of Three Medical Men. A great deal of Discussion took place on the whole Question.

Do you know on what Day that Meeting was held?

No.

The Association had been formed previous to that Meeting on the 16th of June ?

Yes.

Had you seen those Resolutions advertised in the Papers ?

No; I dare say they had been shown to me, perhaps in Manuscript, on the Board Day, but I had not seen them before.

They had not been made public?

No; they were not circulated. The first Time I saw them in Print was when I saw them in this Pamphlet, which bears Date November 1837.

The following Letters are read from the Letter Book:

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 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.

John Evered Poole.

Wm. Lakin Caswell.

Joseph Addison.

Horatio N. Tilsley.

Richard B. Ruddock.

Baruch Toogood.

Abraham King.

Gentlemen, 22d June. I am willing to undertake the Care of the Poor in the Cannington District at 4d. per Head on the gross Population, with 10s. for each Case of Midwifery, if sent indiscriminately, but of difficult Cases only One Sovereign each. (Signed) John Evered Poole.

Gentlemen, 23d June.

I lament exceedingly that there could not be found any Means of disposing of the Medical Care of the Poor of your Union but that of Tender, a System which I believe we are all agreed derogates from the Respectability of that Profession of which I have the Honour to be a Member; but the Day having arrived when all Candidates must apply, I beg to state, that with the Experience of a Year, and having in that Time, on the lowest Calculation, ridden 3,000 Miles in the Service of the Union, having dispensed much and some expensive Medicine, with an unlimited Allowance of Leeches to the Poor, and having given up about Two Thirds of my Time, I do not feel at all inclined to deviate from the Scale I last Week proposed, unless it be in favour of the Plan promulgated by an Individual of the Board, which gives a Mileage on the Extent of District. I beg to repeat that I am ready to accept the Office of Surgeon to the North Petherton District at 4} d. per Head on the gross Population of 1831, or on the other Scheme which includes the Mileage; and after the fullest Consideration which I can give the Subject, I am thoroughly convinced that no one can do Justice to the Poor, without making an immense Sacrifice, on lower Terms than these. As regards Midwifery, an Allowance of 20s. for each Case where the Midwife declares her Incompetency. I fear it will not be in my Power to appear before the Board To-day;

692

To-day; but I wish again to state, that I adhere to my former Proposition of attending gratuitously on the Poor for a reasonable Time in case no Arrangement should take place. or under any Circumstances that may otherwise deprive the Poor of Medical Relief. (Signed) Horatio N. Tilly.

From Mr. Young. Gentlemen, 22d June. I beg leave to offer myself as Candidate for the Middlezoy District of the Bridgwater Union. The extreme Distance from me being considerable, I think 40l. per Annum not more than an adequate Remuneration. Should you elect me, I will endeavour by strict Attention to the Duties of the Office to acquit myself to your Satisfaction.

Sir, 25th June. I am willing to undertake the Duties of Medical Officer for the Middlezoy District at the Rate of 33d. per Head on the gross Population, as I specified in the Circular; with 1l. for each Case of Midwifery, provided that difficult ones only be sent, but if I am called to all, then I am ready to attend for 10s. per Case. (Signed) Joseph Addison.

Sir, Huntspill, 22d June. I beg to state that I am ready to undertake the Medical Care of the Poor of the Hunts hill District at 4d. per Head on the gross Population, as taken in the Year 1831. To convince you that I am legally qualified, I have sent in my Diplomas. (Signed) W. Lakin Caswell.

Gentlemen, Bridgwater, 22d June. I beg to offer my professional Services as Surgeon to the Bridgwater District, at 3d per Head on the gross Population according to the last Census, a Fee of a Sovereign being required for each difficult Case of Midwifery; but if all Cases are attended by me indiscriminately, I would then take them at 10s. each. Also I wish the Board particularly to observe, that I could not offer my Services at so low a Rate as 3d per Head were not my Duties mostly within so limited a Space, thereby enabling me to perform them without a Horse. (Signed) Abraham King,

The Differences of Price are in consequence of the Difference of Distance they would have to travel, and so on ?

Yes, I suppose so.

You stated just now that you yourself thought the Offer made was too low ?

The Offer made in the Advertisement of the 22d of May.

Was it ever raised ?

Oh yes, much higher, ultimately.

On the 16th of June the Board elected Two

Medical Men to Two Districts ?

Yes.

They elected them at the Price advertised on the 22d of May? Yes.

There were no Tenders made for the other Districts ?

No.

What Steps did the Board take in order to fill up those other Districts?

They issued another Advertisement, which is in Page 22 of the printed Papers, dated 17th of June, requesting Gentlemen to send in Tenders, and state, the Sums for which they were willing to contract with the Board for Medical Relief. No Sums were fixed, but the Medical Men were requested to make Tenders.

They were requested to send in Tenders by the Date of the 23d?

Yes. The Letters which have been read must have been the Tenders which were sent in answer to that Advertisement.

693

On receiving those Letters, what passed at the Board?

I have no Recollection of being present on the 23d.

It appears, from the Inspection of the Minute Book, that the Witness was not present. You do not know whether any Persons were appointed on that Day to the remaining Five Districts ?

Not of my own Knowledge.

There was another Meeting on the 14th of July for the Purpose of appointing ?

Yes. I think I was from home then.

Was there no intermediate Meeting?

Yes; there was a Meeting every Week.

You know nothing of the Reasons which induced the Board finally to increase some of those Salaries before they were let?

I remember very well that I seconded the Motion on the 16th of June, that the Appointment of the remaining Medical Officers be postponed to this Day Week. I was exceedingly anxious to do, and I did, all I could to heal the Breach between the Guardians and the Medical Men ; and in the meantime I found there was very little Chance of my succeeding, and it was inconvenient for me to attend on that Day. I did not go ; and in consequence of that I know nothing of what was done.

The following Extract is read from the

Minutes of the 23d of June 1837:

“Moved by Thomas Poole, Esquire, and seconded by Mr. James Somers, That the Clerk be directed to advertise in the *Lancet*, *Medical Gazette*, *Morning Chronicle*, *Standard*, *Bristol Mirror*, and *Bath and Cheltenham Gazette* Newspapers, for Medical Gentlemen to take charge of the Poor of the under mentioned Districts, at the Salaries affixed to each.”

Probably you did not like the State into which the Board had got, of violent Discussions ?

I take my Share of any Reproach that may fall upon the Board in that respect. I am quite certain we never intended to slight or insult the Medical Men. I was from home for a Month after that.

You do not know what induced the Guardians mainly to increase the Salaries beyond their advertised and previous Intention ?

No. Perhaps I may be allowed to say, that I think, had it not been for this Meeting which the Medical Men at Bridgwater held to form an Association, it is exceedingly probable the Breach might have been healed, and we might have come to Terms with the Medical Men on the 16th of June. I was very anxious that Mr. Tilsley should be appointed to his own District. I thought him a very humane Man, and a Man of Talent; and I recollect going into an adjoining Room on the 16th of June to speak to him, and ask him whether he would leave himself in my Hands, and permit me to propose him to the Board, with such Salary as I thought right; and whether he would, if elected, accept the Appointment. He told me he was much obliged to me for the Offer, but, as he had joined a Medical Association, he did not feel himself at liberty to accept any Appointment without the Sanction of the Committee of Three Medical Men. I have no Doubt if I had proposed him the Board would have been ready to give him a somewhat higher Salary, and would have elected him.

Supposing that Course had been taken on the Receipt of the original Letter of the 2d of June, would not these unfortunate Disputes with the Medical Persons have been prevented ?

I can scarcely answer that Question.

What is your Opinion ?

I think that the Resolutions of the Association prevented the healing of the Breach on the 16th of June, more especially the Fourth. “ Moved by Mr. King, and seconded by Mr. Poole, That this Meeting pledges itself not to accept any Appointment under the Poor Law Amendment Act without the Sanction of the Committee.” So

that any Gentleman who joined that Association was not a free Agent; and when I proposed

694

a free Agent; and when I proposed to the Board to put Mr. Tilsley in nomination, they said to me, you must first of all give us a Pledge that Mr. Tilsley will accept the Appointment. I left the Room to ask him, and his Expression was, "I am sailing in the same Boat with the other Medical Men, and I cannot pledge myself to accept any Appointment without consulting them; and it is therefore useless for you to mention my Name to the Board." I returned to the Board, and stated that those Resolutions had foiled our good Intentions.

On a full Consideration, are you of opinion that the Medical Officers of that District are overpaid upon the now increased Salaries which have been given to them ?

No, I do not think they are ; I think they are very fairly paid.

Are they paid as much as they are paid in the neighbouring Unions?

They are paid more; and I should state that one Argument the Board continually urged for not increasing the Scale was, that all the neighbouring Unions paid only Three-pence a Head; and I felt the Force of that Argument. They said, "Why should we pay more than any other Unions in West Somerset." I found that the Scale laid down on the 22d of May was much the same as the Medical Men were paid in Taunton and the surrounding Districts.

Was any Dissatisfaction expressed in those surrounding Districts?

I had not heard of any at that Time, but since there has been so much Talk about the Bridgwater Case it has become universal.

Is there any thing in the Circumstances of the surrounding Districts, the that of the Population, or any other Circumstance, that should enable them to perform the Duties at a lower Rate than the Bridgwater Union ?

No, certainly not. If they could perform the Duties at 8d. a Head, I see no Reason why they should receive more in Bridgwater.

It is your Opinion that if they are adequately paid the Bridgwater Union must be too highly paid ?

Yes. If the others are adequately paid, I do not think Bridgwater is too highly paid.

You have heard Complaints lately that they are underpaid?

Yes; that has been the Subject of Discussion

in our Neighbourhood.

Did you ever inquire the Amount of Payments in Dorsetshire?

No. I have referred to the Second Report of the Commissioners, in which it is stated that in the surrounding Counties the Scale was higher than in Somersetshire; and therefore ours was a Scale that was met by the Argument, that in our own County, West Somerset, other Unions were paying the same Salaries we were, and therefore we ought not to raise ours.

Are not the Circumstances of Dorsetshire different in respect of Density of Population ?

I know nothing of it but by passing through it; it is much more extended, no Doubt.

Have you ever been in Wiltshire?

Yes.

Some Parts of Wiltshire are very scattered?

Certainly.

Did the Board ever endeavour to ascertain what might be a proper Remune. ration, by calculating what the additional Expense to a Medical Person would be in consequence of taking those Districts, and what would be left to him as actual Profits ?

I can only speak as to the first Year; it was that Year I was a Member of the Committee; I must say, we were so much in the Dark in the Matter, we were guided very much by Mr. Weale, and I thought his Experience ought to enable us to judge what was a fair Remuneration. I do not know the Principles on which the Committee proceeded the Second Year, not being a Member of the Committee.

695

Of course you would know that a Person who is in Practice, and used One Horse, would be obliged to increase the Quantity of Horseflesh for the Purpose of attending his Patients?

Yes, in a large District.

Would it not be necessary to take into your Consideration the Quantity of Medicines he dispenses to the Poor ?

Yes; but then on the other hand the Appointments in our own Neighbour hood are frequently sought for, because it enables Medical Men to take Pupils, and to see a great deal of Practice they would not otherwise see.

Is there not another Reason, that it is to prevent other Medical Men coming in and depriving them of their Practice?

Certainly.

If a Gentleman is in considerable Business, and

rides about upon his usual Practice, does not he call upon them in his Visits ?

Yes; but in North Petherton I think Mr. Tilsley was obliged to have an additional Horse in consequence. If you take . Addison's District, the Middlezoy District, that was much smaller; and I should say that no Second Horse would be necessary. I think indeed that District was on a higher Scale in proportion than the others.

Did you ever ascertain how far it was the Fact, that after paying their Expense they receive a Remuneration for their Time and Trouble?

It was impossible for me to find out what the Profit was ; but I thought upon the 3d, a Head they were badly paid, seeing what Duties they performed; and § was the Reason I suggested that the Board should have a different £.

Do you think that they derive any Profit?

Yes; I think there must have been, or they would not have taken the District at all.

You do not think other Circumstances, that is, the additional Practice, and the Advantage in respect of Pupils, and the keeping other Persons out of their District, would have been sufficient ?

No.

Most of those Gentlemen are young Men; are there any young Men who are come to take Districts in your Neighbourhood ?

No, I think not; some are older Men. Mr. Phillips I think is an old Man who has been in Practice a great Number of Years; he was in Business before the Apothecaries Act. There was a great deal of Discussion about his Election.

Generally speaking they are Medical Men ?
Generally speaking they are: Mr. Baruch Toogood is a young Man; but he is a Man in very fair Practice.

He was in Partnership with his Father?

Yes.

May not a young Medical Man undertake the Charge of a District at a very insufficient Remuneration, but with a view to becoming known in his Profession, and to acquiring further Experience ?

That is very possible, but I think that was not the Case with the Majority of our Medical Men; Mr. Tilsley, for example, for one, has been established for some Years; Mr. Phillips and Mr. Addison have been in Practice some Years; Mr. Abraham King has been in Practice for some Years; Mr. Baruch Toogood has been in very good Practice, but he is a young Man.

He has removed since ?

Yes. Mr. Tilsley, Mr. Addison, Mr. Phillips,

and Mr. King have all been in Practice for some Years; they are not new Comers, or Persons very anxious to get the Appointment for the Purpose of being brought into notice.

When receiving Letters from Medical Men, did you make Inquiries whether they were qualified both as Surgeons and Apothecaries ?

No, not when we received Tenders. I seconded a Proposition some Time in May 1837,

696

that every Medical Man in our Union should be both a Licentiate of the Apothecaries Company and a Member of the College of Surgeons, and stated my Grounds for the Motion, that I thought it of the utmost Importance that we should secure the very best Surgical and Medical Attendance for the Poor, and more particularly Surgical Attendance, because a Labourer is apt to meet with some Accident, and if he has not a good Surgeon to attend him he may be incapacitated for Life.

You were in a great Minority upon that Motion were you not?

I was in a Minority on the Motion, certainly. There was some Discussion at the Time ; some Gentlemen said, that they thought it was not in accordance with the Principle of the Poor Law Amendment Act; that the Act implied that either an Apothecary or a Surgeon or a Physician was qualified to be a Medical Officer under that Act. At the Time I seconded the Resolution I had not read the Correspondence in the Second Report of the Commissioners, There is a long Correspondence there between the Board and the Apothecaries Company.

You do not consider any Person qualified to act as a general Practitioner in the Country who is not at the same Time both an Apothecary and Surgeon?

Yes; since my Attention has been more particularly drawn to the Act, I consider that either a Surgeon, a Physician, or an Apothecary is qualified to be a Medical Officer.

To you mean the Poor Law Act ?

Yes.

The Question is whether you consider a Man qualified to discharge his Duties as a general Practitioner in the Country unless he has become both an Apothecary and Surgeon ?

I still think, as a general Principle, that it is most desirable that a Medical Officer should be both a Member of the College of Surgeons and a Licentiate of the Apothecaries Company, for the Reasons I have just stated, in order that we may

secure the very best Medical and Surgical Attendance.

Can a Person who is only an Apothecary act with Propriety as a Surgeon?

I should not like to call in an Apothecary to perform a surgical Operation.

Does the Law require that a Man should have passed the College of Surgeons ?

No.

Does not it stand to Reason, that a Person, in order to perform with Safety a Surgical Operation, must have a due Knowledge of Surgery?

Certainly.

Do you think that any Person who is merely a Surgeon is competent to prescribe as an Apothecary?

He is liable to Penalties under the Apothecaries Act.

In your Opinion is he competent?

I should not, in my own individual Case, consider a Man competent; that is to say, if my Family required the Advice of a Physician, I should not call in a Surgeon.

Do you not think that every Person who pretends to act as a Surgeon ought to be a Member of the College of Surgeons?

Yes, I think so; because then the Public would have a Guarantee that he has had a proper Education; but it is not necessary. I apprehend, according to Law, a Man may practise Surgery without being a Member of the College.

Your private Opinion is that the Law meant to restrain that?

What I said was, that if I employed a Surgeon myself I should rather have a Man to attend me whom I knew to be a Member of the College of Surgeons.

If that Proposition which you supported and which you seconded had been carried it would have excluded Mr. Phillips and Mr. Young, the one being a Member of the College of Surgeons, and not a Licentiate of the Apothecaries Company, and the other a Licentiate of the Apothecaries Company, and not a Member of the College of Surgeons ?

697

I have since been told it would ; but at the Time I seconded this Proposition I had no Idea of either of them.

In what District does Mr. Young practise ?

The Hill District.

If he had been excluded would there have been any other Medical Man in that District capable of being

chosen so handy for the Paupers?

I believe not.

With respect to Mr. Phillips's District, if he had been excluded would there have been any other Medical Man in that District qualified to act?

No, I believe not.

Do you not think it is of more Advantage in many Cases that immediate Assistance should be given to the Person, than that rather more skilful Assistance should be given if it is to be fetched from a great Distance?

Certainly, if you have to go to a great Distance.

Do you suppose that if those Persons had not been chosen other competent Persons would not have been found ?

I think not nearer than Bridgwater.

Would they not have come to establish themselves in those Districts?

I think not. -

Therefore, to push the Argument a little further, if a Man were neither a Surgeon nor an Apothecary, if he lived in the District he might be employed?

No ; I do not think the Board would have elected any one who was neither a Surgeon nor an Apothecary.

What Steps did you take, except seeing those Gentlemen's Certificates that they were Licentiates of the Apothecaries Company, or Members of the College of Surgeons, to ascertain whether they were supposed to have a sufficient Experience to undertake the Duty they contracted for ?

They all produced a great Number of Testimonials from Surgeons and Practitioners in London and different Places, under whom they had been studying, whose Lectures they had attended; some from Sir Astley Cooper, others Sir Benjamin Brodie, and so on.

You were not present on the 14th of July ?

I think not.

Did you ever see Mr. Ward's Testimonials ?

No ; I was not there when he was elected.

You know nothing with respect to his previous Practice or the Testimonials he had received?

No.

You are not a Relation of Mr. Abraham King ?

No.

Do you remember a Person of the Name of Robert Kidner being committed by B. as a Magistrate for neglecting his Wife and Family?

Perfectly well.

Did you at the Time take any Depositions in Writing ?

I believe our Clerk did; he always did. Mr. Warry and Mr. Allen were present.

Do you recollect the Circumstances of the Case ?

Yes; the Man lived in my Parish, and I knew him. The Case was this: He was charged with leaving his Family in the Workhouse; he ran away, and left them in the Workhouse, and the Case was very clearly proved. I consulted Mr. Warry and Mr. Allen, who were on the Bench, and proposed to make Three Offers to Kidner, which were these ; first, that he should go back to the Work house, and there remain with his Wife and Family; if he did not like that, that he should go to the Workhouse and fetch out his Wife and Family, and bring them Home to

698

Petherton, then Home to Petherton, and if I found that he was using his best Endeavours to maintain them by his Labour, that if he could not wholly maintain them by his Labour I would myself make Application to the Board of Guardians for his Relief; and I held out a strong Hope that my Application would be acceded to ; then, that if he adopted neither of these Offers that he should go to Gaol. Mr. Warry and Mr. Allen fully concurred in my making that Suggestion to him which I did. He turned round to a Man who was by his Side, a Man of the Name of Trott, who also lives in my Parish, and who is a most notorious Man, who had been then in Gaol Nineteen Times, —I saw him turn round and consult that Man, and, after speaking Two or Three Words to him, he said, "I will not do either of the other Things; I will go to Gaol." I said, "Well, we think you a great Fool for so doing; but if you will not accept either of the other Things you must go to Gaol."

You knew the Man well ?

Yes, for he was a most notorious Character; he was always in Liquor. Some Three or Four Months before that a Neighbour of mine came up to ask my Wife for some broken Victuals for Kidner's Wife, saying she was very ill, also asking me to try to get some Relief from the Board of Guardians. Hearing she was very ill, I went and called upon her. I saw her lying upon Straw, with every Mark of the most squalid Poverty; a Neighbour was at her Bed-side, and on the other Side a little Cup of Milk and Water. I asked her whether she had been in that State long. She said, "I have been working as long as I can to sustain my Children; as long as I had Health I did all I could do, but not a single Farthing can I get from my Husband; I am

starving, and he has been for some Time earning Wages of a Farmer in the Parish, and has never brought me a single Shilling since I have been in this State." I could scarcely believe the Story. I said, "Your Husband must be a Brute!". The Neighbour sitting by said it was all perfectly true; that she (Kidner) had been maintaining the Family, and doing the best she could for them, but that the Father sets them a very bad Example, and treats her like a Brute; that she was at the Point of Starvation. I gave the other Woman Money to purchase **Necessaries, and said, "I will go to the Board at the next Meeting, and represent your Case, and I have no Doubt you will get Relief."** I went to Mr. #. the Medical Officer, in the meantime, to know whether her Statement was correct; she said she had a Blister on at the Time; he said the Woman's Story was perfectly correct, and that as far as he could understand her Case it was a Case almost of Starvation; that the Woman was left without the Necessaries of Life, owing to the Husband's bad Conduct, notwithstanding his Earnings were considerable. I represented the Case to the Board of Guardians, and they immediately ordered Relief. I think it was a Part of their Order that the Husband's Wages might be attached. When that was done I think I then went to the Master, and ascertained that the Woman's Story was true. I have since seen the Woman; she has been in the Workhouse almost from the Time of her Husband deserting her. I saw her Five or Six Weeks ago, and she said, "for God's Sake do not ever let me go out of the Workhouse, I am quite happy here; but if I go home to my Husband, he will starve me, as he did before."

Was Kidner an able-bodied Man ?

Yes.

What were the Wages he was earning ?

He was earning the usual Wages of our Neighbourhood, which are very low, 7s. a Week; but I have had Reason to believe that he never brought home any thing; and I believe it is from the bad Example he has set his Family they have turned out so badly; the eldest Boy has been in Prison several Times, and is there now on a Charge of Housebreaking.

The Board ordered her into the Workhouse on your Representation?

They ordered Relief in the first instance, and that his Wages should be attached; that went on for some Time, and the Medical Officer attending her. At last the Landlord said, "You cannot afford to pay the Rent, and must leave the House;" she then said, "Will you take us

into the Workhouse?" We took them in, and this Man ran away from the Workhouse,

He was taken into the Workhouse?

Yes.

699

Did Kidner ever work for you?

No.

Could he earn the same Rate of Wages that others could earn ?

Yes; the Wages in our Neighbourhood are 7s. ; but then they get Cider; they are great Cider Drinkers in our Neighbourhood.

In point of fact they were not driven into the Workhouse by any Refusal of relief?

Not the least.

Do you know what Relief they had received before they were taken into the House?

I find he applied for Relief on the 25th of November 1836, but I have not got the Amount; that he applied again on the 6th of December, and on the 18th of December they came into the Workhouse; that I think was when the Landlord of the Cottage turned him out.

You do not know when they received Relief on the first Occasion ?

I remember they received Relief on my Application; that was in November.

How long have the Wages been so low as 7s. a Week?

Ever since I can remember.

Have the Wages increased since the Introduction of the new Poor Law?

No, I believe not.

Have they not rather decreased ?

No ; they have been quite stationary. It is because they have not increased I have in many Instances urged the sending able-bodied Paupers who come to our Board for Relief into the Workhouse, for the Purpose of inducing the Farmers to raise the Rate of Wages.

Has that succeeded in doing so?

It has never been tried to any Extent. Some of the Farmer Guardians, I believe, thought it hard in me to urge them to go in, and very few able-bodied Paupers have gone.

Have not the Prices of Agricultural Produce increased ?

Yes, lately.

Without any corresponding Increase of Wages ?

Yes. I have often told the Farmer Guardians

at their Meetings that I was quite sure it never could be the Intention of the Act to put the whole of the Money they had gained into their own Pockets, which they have done; for they have put the Money saved for Rates into their Pockets, and not raised the Rate of Wages.

There are a good many Shopkeepers in your Neighbourhood?

Only in Bridgwater. I speak of my own Parish of Petherton; there are 4,000 Inhabitants in North Petherton who are all Agriculturists.

How much in fact have you saved on the Assessment? -

I cannot speak to the whole Union, but I can to my own Parish : The first Year we saved 600l.; and I made very particular Inquiries among the Poor that Year, and ascertained that the old and infirm were far better taken care of than before.

Do you know the whole Amount of your Assessment for that Parish?

The average annual Assessment is 2,369l. Many old People in that Parish have come to me, and expressed their great Gratitude for what had been done for them, for that their Relief had been greater than it was before, although our Expenditure was very great. A Person who was old and infirm got only 2s. a Week, and that indeed only at uncertain Times, for the Overseer, instead of paying them weekly, allowed it continually to go into arrear; now they get 2s. 6d. a Week, and get it regularly every Week.

Supposing the Board of Guardians had given a Salary to the Medical Officer of North Petherton equal to that at last given, instead of confining

700

themselves to the Sum at first proposed, what Increase would that have made to your Rates in Petherton ?

The Difference in rate was only about Ten or Twelve Pounds; but that does not all belong to our Parish.

How much of that would belong to your Parish?

I suppose about Three Quarters; ours is by far the largest Parish, and I think the District embraces about Three other parishes.

If those additional 10l. or 12l. had been given by the whole District, the Diminution of Saving, in your Parish, would be as 10l. to 600l.?

Yes.

North Petherton, you say, is a very large Parish ; have you any and what Reason to know that the smaller Parishes have obtained an equal Diminution in their Rates ?-

No ; from what I have heard the Guardians say at the Board, it has been somewhat less. I believe we have gained more than other Parishes, but the great Majority have gained, though not to the same Extent.

Have you heard any Complaint, that, though there may have been a Saving in the Relief of the Poor, that is swelled up by the Expenses?

I never heard of any such Complaint, except that my Neighbour, Sir John Slade, lives in a small village. where there are not above Half a Dozen Families, and One or Two Paupers; he said that his Rates were increased, because he had to pay a Share of the Establishment Charges, and that it cost him more than it did before. I believe there are only Two Paupers in the Parish.

Do you know how much more it cost him?

I cannot say; it was very trifling. The accompanying Paper will show. Account of Money expended by each Parish for Year ending Midsummer 1837. (A.)

BRIDGwATER UNIon.

Average S. A. - Oney expende Parishes. Annual f. . ending Assessment. | Midsummer 1837. £' £ s. d. #

Bridgwater -	2,916 1,888 0 2+
Chedzoy --	451 284 19 23
Wembdon - 202	163 3 94
Durleigh - - 138	99 10 li
Chilton Trinity - - - - -	55 36 3 94
Cannington - - - - -	772 499 11 6+
Ashcott - - - - -	156 135 13 10
Grenton - - - - -	89 32 14 10+
Moorlinch - - - - -	70 52 19 3+
Shapwick - - - - -	165 121 19 0
Catcott - - - - -	168 125 3 73
Edington - - - - -	146 108 18 3
Chilton Polden - - - - -	187 96 13 53
Cossington - - - - -	134 83 19 3}
Woolavington - - - - -	232 150 7 33 ##
Puriton - - - - -	146 131 12 53
Pawlett - - - - -	221 135 13 7+
Huntspill - - - - -	661 452 18 14
Bawdrip - - - - -	124 71 19 0
Sutton Mallett - - - - -	89 48 18 9
Stawell - - - - -	97 63 10 13
Middlezoy - - - - -	157 129 16 S
Othery - - - - -	326 137 10 7
Lyng - - - - -	166 137 5 SI

Goathurst - - - - - 280 116 14 8+

Broomfield - - - - - 483 265 14 94

701

**Total Amount of
Parishes. *...* Money expended
Assessment. for the Year ending
Midsummer 1887.**

£ £' s. d.

Thurloxtton - - - - -

68 33 16 4+

Michael Church - - - - - 6 6 16 0;

Westonzoyland - - - - - 429 262 19 94

North Petherton - - - - - 2,369 1,696 12 104

Fiddington - - - - - 87 70 4 8

Edstock and Beer - - - - - 21 23 13 7

Stockland Bristol - - - - - 102 61 7 84

Otterhampton - - - - - 182 86 1 7

Charlinch - - - - - 204 156 10 11

Enmore - - - - - 186 144 12 14

Spaxton - - - - - 601 238 9 4}.

Asholt - - - - - 95 70 2 113

Over Stowey - - - - - 147 105 6

11 Nether Stowey - - - - - 309 146 5 11+

Total - - - || 13,387 8,674 12 11

ROBERT UNDERDOWN, Clerk.

Do you consider that this Parish, in which there are only Two Paupers, required the Introduction of the new Poor Law ?

I think small Parishes must contribute with others; I think it would have been very unwise to have left out that small Parish.

What may have been the Population of that Parish in which there were but Two Paupers?

I do not know; the Parish consists of very few Fields; I should think not Half a Dozen Families. It happens to be a very small Parish, within the Bounds of North Petherton; and there is a little Chapel of Ease.

In this well-managed Parish One Third of the Inhabitants are Paupers?

I mention that as being the only Complaint I have heard, and I think that was made more in Joke than any thing else. I have never heard of any other small Parish complaining that their Expenses had been increased rather than diminished.

Is it not your Opinion that this increasing Expense which fell upon the small Parish arose

entirely from the Expense incurred in the Erection of Poorhouses, and that after that Expense was paid off the Expense of that Parish would be less than it was before ?

Yes, I should think it would. The Expense must have been exceedingly small at all Times; but I should say there is no Reason it should not be rather less than before.

Small Parishes being called on to contribute with other Parishes to the Erection of Poorhouses, an extra Expense has been laid upon them?

Yes; they had no Workhouse of their own, being so small a Parish, which they could turn into Money, and which would have helped them to bear their Share of the Expense.

They did not want a Workhouse?

No ; because they have no Paupers in the Workhouse at present.

You state that in a Parish consisting of about Six Families Two of them are Paupers ?

I do not even know that Two are Paupers; I am by no means certain that there is more than One ; I know they have One, because in turning over the Names of the Parishes when I have come to the Parish of Michael Church I think there is only One Pauper mentioned.

Do you know the Amount your Parish paid for the Erection of Workhouses last Year ?

The Workhouse has been erected during the last Year. I do not know the Proportion. I know

702

the Proportion. I know the Parishioners have calculated that the Sale of the old Workhouse would amply pay their Proportion of the Expense of the Erection of the new one.

You say you saved 600l. the first Year?

Yes.

That would be independent of your Quota towards the Workhouse?

Yes. We must have paid something towards it, because it was begun before the End of the first Year.

Was it indemnified by the Sale of the old Workhouse? "

It is not sold at present; we think of letting it; we think we shall receive 30l. a Year for it.

Who will receive the Rent; the Parish or the Union ?

That will go to the Parish.

To return to Kidner's Case; when he was brought before you as a Magistrate did he state . Reason for having left the Workhouse ?

No, I do not think he did.

Did he complain of the Workhouse in any respect?

No ; he certainly did not complain of any Ill-usage. My Impression is, that he said he went out to look for Work.

Did he state where he went to ?

No; he did not say where he had been.

Did he speak of having been ill kept in the Workhouse in any respect?

No, certainly not.

Did he say that he left it in consequence of being afraid of catching the Diarrhoea ?

No, certainly not.

Was there any Diarrhoea in the House at that Time?

It was in March 1837. I think there was. I was not in the habit of visiting the Bridgwater Workhouse, having a Workhouse at Petherton which was used; but I think there was Diarrhoea there at that Time.

Turn to Page 78, and look at the Note at the Bottom and also at the Top of the Page 2 -

I believe if the Author of that Pamphlet, Mr. Bowen, had happened to know that Mr. Allen had joined in the Commitment that Paragraph would never have appeared.

Why So ?

Mr. Allen has always taken very much the same View of the Poor Law Administration Mr. Bowen has done; and I think if he had known that his (Allen's) Name had been coupled with Mr. Warry's and my own, it is very likely he would not have made that Accusation; and it is quite clear that Mr. Allen forgot that he had committed the Man, for when the Subject was considered at the Board on a subsequent Day, on which I was not present, he was making some Observations, and Mr. Warry showed him the Commitment with his own Name attached to it, which he appeared to have forgotten ; and he said he was very sorry that he had joined in committing him.

Do you conceive that Mr. Bowen takes his Opinions from Mr. Allen; that he is incompetent to judge for himself?

I think he is quite able to judge for himself.

He is a very able Man ?

Yes.

And a very respectable Man?

I think it is rather unfair in Mr. Bowen to have made the Allusions he has to Mr. Warry and myself as Magistrates. I should not have acted so if I had been in his Situation.

Are you sure that Kidner was earning 7s. a week?

Yes; from all the Inquiries I made.

703

Did you learn that from his Master ?

Yes. I think I did.

His Wife did not tell you, did she ?

I heard it from several Persons. I am quite sure that the Wife told me so. I * satisfied that he was earning 7s, a Week. Part of the Wages were attached. -

He told you he would rather go to Prison ?

Yes

Do you happen to know whether the Provision is better or worse in the Prison than in the Workhouse?

I do not know at this Moment.

Did you ever hear it was better than in the Workhouse?

No

Do you think that when he was receiving 7s. a Week Wages, and 4s. a Week Allowance, that was sufficient to maintain him and his Wife and Family, consisting of Five Children ?

I know that a great Number of Labourers in our Parish do maintain them selves upon that Sum. I confess it appears to me very small indeed, and I have often wondered how they could maintain themselves upon that Sum.

You have said that Part of his Wages were attached; what did you mean by that; had he the full Benefit of those Wages, or not ?

When the Board of Guardians relieved his Wife and Family they got him to refund out of his Wages a Part of that Relief; there was an Order made by the Board that the Relieving Officer should go to the Master, and tell him that the Board of Guardians had allowed so much to the Wife and Family of Kidner, and that the Master was to pay a certain Portion into the Relieving Officer's Hands, which I believe was done; and I suppose the Master got Kidner to assent.

Then in that Case he did not get 11s. a Week?

He himself did not; then the Money allowed by the Board was paid into the Hands of the Woman.

In point of fact, for the Maintenance of the Father, Mother, and Five Children, there was but the 7s. a Week ?

I do not think that the Wages were attached for the whole Sum.

For what Part of it were they attached?

I cannot recollect.

Was the whole Sum allowed 4s. a Week?

I cannot carry that in my Mind.

At what Time did you mean to say that Part of his Wages were attached; before he went into the Workhouse, or since he has gone out and left his Wife and Family?

Before he went into the Workhouse.

How much of that 7s. which you suppose him to have received was attached?

I really do not know without referring to the Relieving Officer's Books.

If you think that the 11s. was only sufficient to support his Family, if he had only 7s. he must have been in Circumstances of great Distress?

He must.

How then could you think of giving him Part, and then taking back another Part ?

I suppose a Shilling a Week was taken back, or something of that Kind, till the whole was discharged.

Did he in any way consent that this should be allowed to his Wife as a Loan to him, and that his Wages should be attached?

I do not think he did. It was I who made the Application on the Part of the Wife. My Impression is, that the Relieving Officer was ordered to go to the Master of the Labourer to tell him what we had done, and to get him to

704

make an Arrangement that Kidner should refund a certain Part of his Wages to repay the Loan.

If any Consent was obtained for that it was obtained from the Relieving Officer ?

Yes, I suppose so; from him or the Master.

What was the Name of the Relieving Officer ?

Chinn.

Have you any Doubt that he came with his Wife and Family into the Work house in consequence of finding himself uncomfortable on the Allowance he received ?

He came there as a Place of Shelter; the Landlord turned them out, and they had no Place to go to ; and I think when first they came in it was by Order from the Overseer, having no Shelter.

He did not come by his own Choice, but from Necessity ?

He came in, having an Order from the

Overseer; having no Place to go to.

At the Time he came in he was dissatisfied, and he got away as soon as he could, and left his Wife and Family there?

He ran away.

Where is he now ?

The last Time I saw him was about Five Weeks ago in Petherton, about Five o'Clock in the Evening; he was walking along the Road so drunk he could hardly stand. I do not know for whom he is working.

Does the Parish receive any Money from him now for the Support of his Family?

No, certainly not; the Parish consider him incorrigible, and let him go where he will.

His Wife and Family are in the Workhouse ?

Yes, they were, Five Weeks ago, and I believe are now.

At what Charge per Head are they there?

I think for a grown Person, an Adult, it is 2s. 6; d. per Head per Week. I think altogether it amounts to 3s. 4d. or 8s. 6d., including Clothing and every thing.

How much for a Child?

I forget.

You stated that Kidner brought his Wife home no Part of his Wages ?

She told me so, and the Neighbours corroborated that.

That induced you to make the Application to the Board ?

Certainly. I saw the Woman was in great Distress indeed, and that through mo Misconduct of hers.

The Board ordered Relief?

Yes.

Did you ever make Inquiry afterwards how far the Man continued in that Practice of not bringing home any Part of his Wages to his Wife ?

No, I did not ; for it was very shortly after that that they went into the Workhouse-in less than a Month after that,-about a Fortnight or Three Weeks, probably.

You have stated that before that Illness she had maintained her Family?

She told me so herself. -

Do you know what she earned ?

I suppose she earned about the usual Wages of Women, which is varying from 8d. to 10d, a Day.

Was she working as an Agricultural Labourer?

Yes; and I have heard many Farmers speak of her as a hard-working Woman; and perhaps

One or Two of her Children got 2d, or 3d, a Day.

705

She did not complain as long as she was well ?

No. She said, "If it pleases God to give me my Health I will struggle on, though he does not bring me a Farthing."

Supposing her to be in good Health, and that the Husband had brought home the 7s, a Week, joined to what she could have earned herself, would that Family have been worse off than the Generality of Families in that Neighbourhood?

Certainly not; they would have been better off than many.

You were Vice Chairman of the Board of Guardians in the Month of October 1836?

Yes.

Do you recollect a Letter from Mr. Abraham King, the Surgeon of the Bridgwater District, being read on the 25th of October, respecting the Alteration of the Diet in the Workhouse ?

No, I do not recollect; I do not think I was present. The original Letter appears set out in Page 81. of the printed Papers; but I recollect nothing about it.

Did you attend the Board during the Existence of the Diarrhoea ?

Yes; I was there very constantly at that Time, and I heard the Subject often mentioned. Sometimes it was said there was Diarrhoea, and then pro the Inmates were much more healthy; and so it varied from Time to Time. In fact on One or Two Occasions I went over the House, though I was not in the habit of visiting that House, as I was Visitor of the North Petherton; sometimes I found a vast Number of Patients ill, and probably the next Time there were a very few ill.

Do you know of any Applications of Mr. Abraham King on the Subject of the Diarrhoea, previous to this Letter of the 25th of October?

No, I do not.

Do you know that there were none ?

What I heard regarding the Diarrhoea was principally in Conversation. I think there was nothing came officially to the Board. "I do not remember any official Report of the Surgeon.

You say you know more of North Petherton Workhouse than you do of the Bridgwater ?

Yes; I constantly visited that, as I live in the Parish.

Was the Diarrhoea in that Workhouse?

Certainly not; I do not think there was a

single Case of Diarrhoea commencing there. There were a great many Children removed to that Workhouse, after they had been suffering from Diarrhoea, by the Medical Men of Bridgwater. Several of them died after they came into that Workhouse; others recovered; but I think I can say confidently not a single Case of Diarrhoea originated there.

Do you know whether any Children who had the Measles in the North Petherton Workhouse had had the Diarrhoea in the Bridgwater, or not?

Yes; I think I heard the Matron say that several of the Children appeared to have quite a Complication of Disorders.

Did you hear any Complaints of the Inmates of North Petherton Workhouse of the Gruel ?

Not at all; they appeared perfectly satisfied. I have gone over the House when they have been at their Meals, and have conversed with them. The Dietary was precisely the same at Petherton as at Bridgwater during the Time that the Diarrhoea was prevailing there.

Do you remember the Name of Harriet Binden ?

Yes.

Was she ill ? -

Yes; she was in Bed.

Did she complain to you?

Not the least; on the contrary, she expressed great Gratitude for the Attention she had received. I asked her whether there was any thing I could do to make her more comfortable

706

I saw her Two or Three Times. The first Time I saw her she was labouring under ulcerated sore Throat; she said she should like a little Honey and Vinegar; the Matron said, "She had none, but she supposed there could be no Objection to it;" and I sent her some ; and I put the same Question to her at other Times. She said, "She was perfectly comfortable, but that she should like to see One of her Children; she thought she was dying; that she should be more comfortable to have her Children about her; and she had asked the Matron to apply to the Governor, and he thought, of his own Accord, he could not give an Order for the Child to be allowed to go to her." I said, "I would undertake the Child should be sent to her," which he was in a Day or Two, and she thanked me for it.

Will you refer to her Deposition in Page 29 of the printed Papers, and state whether that is a fair Statement of the Circumstances referring to Harriet

Binden ?

Yes, I believe that is perfectly correct. I do not think she ever said any thing to me about Tea and Sugar ; she often expressed herself grateful, and said the Matron was very kind to her.

Do you know whether in that Case what was ordered by the Doctor, and was not sent immediately from the Bridgwater Union, Mrs. Ellis supplied out of her own Stores, and replaced ?

Yes, I know in many Cases she did do that ; and I am sure that if Tea and Sugar were wanted she would let her have them. She expressed herself very thankful for the Attention she received several Times, and I know the Matron was very kind to her. She mentions, I see, about the Child being sent to her; and I know that it was sent. I think I wrote to the Governor that same Day to beg he would send out the Child immediately.

That was Govier ?

Yes.

Is he the Governor now ?

No.

There was a visiting Committee of the Workhouse, was there not?

Yes.

Did they make their Report in a Book?

Yes; that was read every Day at the Meeting of the Board.

Had you no verbal Communications with the Members of the Visiting Committee ?

I have heard Members of the Visiting Committee sometimes say there was a good deal of Diarrhoea in the House, and perhaps on the next Board Day the same Gentlemen might say we are happy to say the House is in a much better State. It varied a great deal. There was always a great deal of Disease, I have heard, in that House, before the Union. I do not think the House is in a healthy Situation; it lies low.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

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

YOU are One of the Assistant Poor Law Commissioners ?

I am.

What is your District?

Somersetshire, the larger Part of Worcestershire, and the larger Part of Gloucestershire.

The Bridgwater Union is of course within your District ?

It is. I formed the Union.

At the Time the Union was formed did you give any Directions to that Board with respect to the Division of their Union into Districts for Medical Attendance, and with respect to the Remuneration to be given to the Medical Officers ?

I advised a Committee to be appointed to divide the Union into Districts, and that the Scale of Remuneration should be at the Rate of Three-pence

707

per Head upon the whole Union; of course telling the Guardians they would make * Difference in those Districts where the Population was more dense to what they would where the Population was more scattered.

On what Principle did you fix Three-pence a Head?

On first starting I recommended the System of advertising for Tenders; the Medical Gentlemen complained of that System as being derogatory of their Profession; and I stated that as soon as I could ascertain the proper Rate of Remuneration I should be happy to adopt another Plan. In forming the Union of Clutton, which is also in the County of Somerset, and a Union where there is no large Town at all, and also a Union where there are a considerable Number of Coal Mines, Medical Gentlemen of high Repute in that Part of the Country addressed a Letter to the Board of Guardians, stating the Terms on which they were willing to undertake the Medical Attendance, and upon that Letter it was I fixed the Sum per Head, and also, upon referring to other Districts, finding that that agreed with the Sums previously paid bv. the Parishes.

Is that the Letter you refer to ?

It is.

Where is the Union of Clutton ?

It is between Bristol and Wells.

Is that a densely populated Country ?

It is not.

Do the People reside in Villages close together ?

Yes; the Villages are generally pretty close together.

Have the goodness to read that Letter to which you have referred?

The same is read, and is as follows:

Gentlemen, Chilcompton, March 1836. From your Advertisement we see you require a Tender of the Terms for Medical and Surgical Attendance on the Poor of the respective Districts of the Clutton Union. We, as

Candidates for the Appointment of Surgeons to the Midsomer Norton District, beg to suggest the following Scale. The Midsomer Norton District contains a Population of 6,869; we consider that only Half that Number as coming into the Cognizance of the Enactments of the "Poor Law Bill," thus, 3,430 may be expected to fall within the Range of the Medical Man's Liability; the Casualties also of this District, being entirely a coaling one, may be expected to be more numerous, and of a more desperate Character than can be the Case in an Agricultural District. With these Views we would name the small Sum of 6d. a Head, making the Amount for One Year's Attendance 85l. 19s. 6d. Now, as the Contingencies in this District have on several Occasions been many, and severe Cases, the same may occur again; and feeling that it cannot be the Wish of either the Guardians or Commissioners that Medical Men should be Losers by the Medical Care of the Poor, we would leave it to the Pleasure of the Board to name what Sum, in addition to the above, they may think proper.

We are,

Your obedient Servants,

Flower and Leach.

To the Guardians of the Clutton Union.

P.S.—We trust these Terms will not be considered too high. Should this Arrangement not meet your Approbation, any Alteration you may think it right to make will be satisfactory to us; and if you place that Confidence in us to give us the Appointment, you may depend on a conscientious Discharge of the Duties of the Situation.

Were those Men of Eminence? -

Yes; Mr. Flower is considered a Man of very great Eminence.

Not ng Men 2 - - -

N. °d. of the most distinguished Medical Men of that District.

What do you conceive he means by Sixpence a Head

Sixpence a Head upon the Half Population; which comes to 85l., which is his Tender.

708

It is upon this you recommended Three-pence a Head?

Yes; and also from the Fact that that was the Rate in many Districts where the Unions had been previously formed, and where they had gone upon the System of Tender. If Three-pence

a Head was satisfactory on a District which was a Coal District, and where there was no Town, I conceived it would be a satisfactory Arrangement with the Medical Men in the Bridgwater Union.

Has it been found a satisfactory Arrangement?

Certainly not. In the Bridgwater District, and in some of the neighbouring Districts, they have this Year made Advances, but in the Majority of Instances they are continuing at that Rate now.

Upon the whole has that Scale been found to answer the Purpose of obtaining proper Persons to attend the Poor, and of affording to those Persons a Remuneration for their Attendance ?

In the Union of Taunton, an adjoining Union, where the Salaries were the same, this Year we had several Medical Men offering themselves at those Salaries.

Have Messrs. Flower and Leach continued their Services for that District upon those Terms ?

Up to the present Time.

Have they got Assistants who help them in performing the Duties ?

There are Two Partners; I do not know whether they have Assistants; the Duties are very satisfactorily performed, both to the Board of Guardians and to the Poor.

Who is the Chairman of that Union ?

Captain Scobell.

Have there been any Complaints in the Union, of which this is One of the Districts, of the Scale of Remuneration for Medical Relief?

I have heard of none in that District. I would also take the Liberty of observing, that at the Time Messrs. Flower and Leach's Tender was made there was no Union Workhouse at all to be made use of therefore every Case must necessarily be attended at the Residence of the Poor; I believe within the last Week or Two the new Workhouse has been occupied, but up to that Time they had no Workhouse.

Were the Inhabitants of that District within a very small Circuit?

No. I can state the farthest Distance of any Pauper from any Medical Man in the Union, but not in the District.

Of course Remuneration must depend very much upon how far a Man had to travel ?

It must. The District referred to is nearly on the Borders of the Mendip Hills, and is as difficult a District as any one can be. I bore that in Mind, and thought that if Three-pence a Head was a fair Remuneration for that District it would be an ample Remuneration for others

where they had not a Liability to the same Accidents which they have here.

It is a Coal Country?

It is.

They were paid 10s, a Case in Midwifery besides?

Yes; in all my Districts they were paid that.

Have you inquired out of your District what is the general Amount of Remuneration to the Medical Officers?

No; I did not feel it to be necessary to do so. I have not been out of my District for Three Years except a very few Weeks, and then only in consequence of domestic Affliction.

How far is any Part of Dorsetshire from Bridgwater?

I suppose about Twenty-five or Thirty Miles.

You have never inquired what the Scale of Remuneration is in that District ?

Never.

709

You are not aware of it?

No.

What Part of Gloucestershire is in your District?

All the Clothing Part, and indeed the whole, with the Exception of the Hills bordering on Oxfordshire.

In consequence of this it was that the Guardians of the Bridgwater Board the first Salaries from June 1836 to June 1837?

Yes

Had they been in the habit, in the Clutton District, of contracting for Medical Relief before the new Poor Law System came into operation?

Yes, generally, in all the Parishes.

What Reference had you to the Scale of Payment previous to the new Poor Law System coming into operation ?

In the Clutton District, previous to the new Poor Law, the Payment was 2½d, upon the whole Union, and afterwards it was 8d. per Head upon the whole Union.

Did that include Fractures ?

It included every thing. I put the Question to the Overseers, the Amount they paid for Medical Relief?

Were the Midwifery Cases included ?

They were included in the 2½d., but not in my Scale.

Must not a higher Scale be taken for a larger District if a Medical Man should require additional

Horse Hire?

710

Yes; and therefore this District being a more difficult District than any within my Reach I thought I was safe in taking that as a Guide to go by, for I think there was as much riding, and as hilly a Country, and more so, than the Part of Somersetshire in which Bridgwater is situate, where the Roads are better, and not so hilly.

Where an additional Horse is kept must not there be a greater Consumption of Time in consequence of the Extent of the District ?

Yes.

Upon the whole you think that this Midsomer Norton District was a fair District to calculate on, taking it as an average District?

I did, and more so; taking also as a Guide the Average of the Amounts paid previous to the Formation of the Union, which Averages I took before coming to that Conclusion. I found the Amount of the average Sum paid previous to the Union was greater in Somersetshire than that fixed by me, according to the Returns made to me. I take those Returns as an Answer to the Question put to the Overseers of the several Parishes: " State the Amount of your Medical Contract for the last Year, if any, and the Amount paid for extra Medical Attendance, separately stated." I find that on comparing Somersetshire previous to the Union, taking the whole County, the Average was 3d. per Head; since then the Average is 2;d, ; but then in one Case the Midwifery Cases are included and in the other they are not, therefore they are much about the Same.

How did the Case stand before the Poor Law Union came into operation with respect to many Paupers being in the Workhouse or not?

There are more in the Workhouses under the new Poor Law than under the old, therefore the Trouble to the Medical Man would be less.

Is it true that One Half the Population would be subject to Medical Relief?

No ; I consider that above the Mark. I wished to take that as furnishing Data to do away with the Tender System, which the Medical Men considered as degrading to their Profession.

Did you apply to the Board of Commissioners in London to know what Remuneration they thought a fair one for Medical Relief?

I did not. I believe it was almost one of the first Objects of the Commissioners to break down the System of advertising for Tenders, when a more satisfactory System could be substituted. The Commissioners approved the Plan

I adopted, and we thought in the course of a Year or Two we should see whether that was a fair Amount of Remuneration.

That was the Scale on which the Arrangement was made for the Year from June 1836 to June 1837 in the Bridgwater Union ?

Exactly. I did not satisfy ^o by taking Somersetshire alone as my Guide. I found that the Amount paid in my Part of Gloucestershire previous to the Union being formed was 2.d. per Head ; now it is 2;d. ; in Somersetshire it was 3d., and now 3; d. ; and in Worcestershire I find it was 3;d., and it is now 2; d.

Are those upon the gross Populations?

I got the Amount in every Union, and have calculated it, applying it to the Number.

In fact you have diminished the Expenses of Medical Attendance since the Union ?

Yes, to a small Extent.

Would there be any Reduction including the Midwifery Cases?

To a very small Extent.

Were they not considered very low before?

I do not know; but I have considered those with reference to the Calculation of 3d. per Head. In the Taunton Union, where I have fixed it at 8d. per Head, a Medical Gentleman writes to me to know whether the Arrangement is permanent, because he is willing to take Two Districts at 50l. less than they have been taken at. I did not think that was right towards the Professional Men, and I did not recommend to the Guardians to take the Offer.

Is that a Gentleman in established ?

Yes; a Gentleman who had previously attended several Parishes.

Will you read the Letter?

The same was read as follows:

Dear Sir, Taunton, 16th November. I trust you will pardon the Liberty I am taking, by wishing you to inform me if the Medical Gentlemen are elected annually in the several Divisions of the Taunton Union, and if so, if they are permitted to offer Tenders for each Division of the same. Having had the largest Parish in the Union, with Four others, prior to the new Poor Law System taking place, I should now be happy to devote the whole of my Attendance to all the Paupers in Two of the Divisions, for 50l. per Annum less than what is now given to the Two Medical Men, and provide an adequate Security for proper Attendance to the same. With regard to Character and Attentions to the Poor in the

Parishes which I have already attended, I can only refer to the Guardians of them; and beg to remain, Your obedient Servant, Robert Rendell.

Has that Gentleman taken any of the Districts?

He has not. I did not feel myself at all called upon, on receiving his Letter, to recommend that he should be applied to ; I did not think the Salaries too high.

They were let from Year to Year?

Yes.

Were they always let to the same Persons, or was it open to others ?

It was open to others.

If this Gentleman could afford to do it for 50l. a Year less, why did not he put that 50l. into his Pocket by offering?

I do not know ; I did not push the Gentleman forward, and he never did offer himself.

If he was correct in that, and could do it for 50l. a Year less than other Persons, do you know any Reason why he did not offer to take any of those Districts ?

He had been a Candidate the first Year, but the Gentlemen once in Practice, and who give

711

Satisfaction to the Union, are not often changed, unless there is some Ground for so doing. It is not always the Practice to advertise for fresh Medical Gentlemen. Previous to the End of the Year Letters are often written to the Gentlemen who are in attendance, to know whether they will continue their Attendance. I believe there was an Election this Year in the Taunton Union, in consequence of a Resignation.

Did this Gentleman make any Offer in consequence of that Resignation ?

I cannot say.

Is he a Gentleman residing at Taunton, and in Business there ?

Yes.

Did you make Inquiries respecting his Character?—

I heard he was in Practice, and attending several Parishes, and that he was a respectable Man. I do not mean to say he is in the first Walk of the Profession; but I believe he is a very respectable Man.

Are you aware that when those Salaries were fixed Complaints were made by the Medical Persons to the Chairman of the Board of Guardians and others rep^d the Insufficiency of

those Salaries?

have heard so since the Medical Pamphlet has been published, but I have had no Conversation with the Medical Gentlemen. I was present at a Meeting at Bridgwater when they stated that they considered their Salaries too low.

Can you state when that was ?

The 23d of June 1837.

Had you heard any Objection previous to that?

I had heard that the Board of Guardians and the Medical Men could not agree.

Had you heard, previous to the 22d of May 1837, that Complaint had been , made by the Medical Officers to any of the Guardians, in respect of the Insufficiency of their Remuneration ?

I had not.

Was there any Communication between you and the Board of Guardians previous to their fixing the new Districts, and the Salary for each District, which appeared in the Advertisement of the 22d of May?

Nothing in regard to the Salaries. I approved of the Principle of their dividing the Union into those Districts, as bringing the Relief more within the Reach of the Poor. That was submitted to me, but not with regard to the Salaries.

When did you first hear of a Difference between the Board and the Medical Men in regard to Salaries?

I think it must have been immediately after the 16th of June that I heard that the Board of Guardians and the Medical Men could not agree.

When did you attend the Board of Guardians ?

I attended the Board of Guardians on the 23d of June.

What occurred then?

The Medical Men had been requested to send in Tenders; considerable Discussion is stated to have taken place; and then I addressed the Board a some Length.

Do you remember the Amount of the Tenders ?

No, I do not ; I have the Particulars of them here.

Did they tender at so much a Head?

Mr. Parker tendered for the Workhouse at 50l. a Year; Mr. Abraham King for the Bridgwater District at 3d. a Head; Mr. William Lakin Caswell for the Huntspill District, at 4!d. a Head; Mr. Addison, for the Middlezoy District, 3!d. a Head; Mr. Nelson Tilsley, at 4%^d. a Head; Mr. John Evered Poole, 4.d. a Head; Mr. Richard

Beadon Ruddock, 4^d, a Head.

Was any Reference made to you as to those Tenders, and your Opinion asked whether they should be accepted?

I remember stating on my entering the Board of Guardians (having only then just arrived at

712

Bridgwater), that the Salaries, at the Rate of 3d. per Head, had been satisfactory in other Districts; but that if after a Year's Experience the Guardians should be of a different Opinion, I would advise the Commissioners to sanction an Increase. On this considerable Discussion took place, many of the Guardians contending that there could be no greater Reason for an Increase in this Union than in any other. I then suggested that the Sense of the Board should be taken, on which it was moved by Mr. Inman and seconded by Mr. Poole, "That in the Opinion of this Board the Tenders of the several Medical Gentlemen are more than an adequate Remuneration for their Services, and that they be not accepted." The Gentleman who moved the Resolution is a Magistrate of the Borough of Bridgwater; the Gentleman who seconded it was a Magistrate of the County.

Did you attend afterwards when the Medical Officers were appointed?

Yes.

Were the Salaries then fixed ?

No ; the Salaries were previously fixed.

When were they fixed ?

They were fixed on the 23d of June.

Was there any Increase from the former Year in those new Salaries so fixed ?

There was.

Did you recommend that Increase ?

I cannot recollect that I did. I was very anxious there should be a Reconciliation between the Medical Men and the Board of Guardians. I endeavoured to conciliate them. Mr. Poole, who is a Magistrate, and who took a great Interest in the Union, and who always took a great Share in the Discussion on Medical Subjects, I think, suggested the Alteration; but it was done with my full Approbation.

Did they state to you at that Time any thing of having received a Letter on the 2d of June in reference to their Advertisement of the 22d of May, from the Medical Officers, stating that the Remuneration offered was too small?

I do not remember; it might have been stated; the Room was a Scene of Confusion. I do not

recollect having any private Conversation myself with any Medical Gentleman.

When you were discussing this Matter, did you learn from them that the whole of the Medical Officers who had been appointed the former Year had written a Letter of the 2d of June, referring to the Advertisement of the Board of Guardians, and stating that the Salaries were too small ?

I am perfectly cognizant of the Letter, of course, the whole of the Minutes of the Board being open to me, but whether my Attention was drawn to it on that Day I cannot say.

You are not aware how far the Board of Guardians took any Steps in consequence of that Letter?

No, I do not recollect that.

Have you frequently been present at the Meetings of that Board?

Yes; I have been as often as my other Duties would allow of it. I cannot state the Number of Times.

Did the same strong Discussions which have gone on at that Board go on in Boards in general?

Up to that Time I do not think it was possible for any Union to proceed more amicably than this Union; and it so proceeded up to the Beginning of June. The first Time I ever saw any unpleasant Feeling in the Board of Guardians was when I attended on the 23d of June.

Since the 23d of June, how has the Board proceeded?

Certainly there has been a great Division of Opinion.

And a Warmth of Feeling?

Yes.

713

Which still exists ?

It does; there is a great Difference of Opinion, certainly.

Has that induced any of the Guardians to absent themselves from that Board ?

Not to my Knowledge. I am aware the Number who have attended has been very great. Though this Feeling showed itself in a Difference of Opinion among the Guardians on this Point previous to the 5th of March, the Board of Guardians unanimously passed an Address to Lord John Russell in favour of the Union.

Was that unanimous ?

I think it was stated that it was without a dissentient Voice.

How many Guardians were there when that

Opinion was expressed ?

I have not heard; there were a considerable Number of Guardians.

Had you suggested to the Guardians the Propriety of such an Address ?

Most assuredly not.

Are you in the habit of making such Suggestions?

Certainly not. I should think Testimony so obtained as utterly worthless.

Have you ever done it in any Instance?

Never, in any One Instance. It was unanimously agreed to, Thirty-three Guardians being then present.

You said that Mr. Bowen never was present when you were there?

He was present Twice or Three Times.

Did he take any very active Part?

Yes; upon the Subject of the Medical Relief.

Did it appear that he had a great many Followers among the Board of Guardians ?

There were certainly some Members of the Board of Guardians that went with him.

How do you account for this Resolution, approving of the Way in which the Poor Law has been worked, passing unanimously, if there were Mr. Bowen and certain others of the Guardians that had not taken this View of it?

Mr. Bowen was not present.

How many Guardians are there?

Fifty or Sixty. , I was not present, and I cannot tell how many Guardians there were upon that Occasion. I believe that many of the Guardians who are opposed to the Bridgwater Union, owing to particular local Circumstances, are not opposed to the Law generally. I do not think that, Mr. Bowen last Year numbered a great many of the Guardians amongst his followers.

Was it carried unanimously?

Yes; so it was reported to me; so it is entered upon the Minutes.

Then the first Time that the Letter of the 2d of June was brought to your Notice was when you attended upon the 23d of June ?

Upon the 23d.

And you made no Remark at that Time as to the Way in which the Board had conducted itself towards those Medical Gentlemen with respect to that Letter of the 2d of June ?

There was a great deal of Communication between the Medical Gentlemen and some Members of the Board of Guardians upon the

Subject; but my Object was, if possible, to conciliate, and when the Medical Gentlemen would not take it upon the Terms that the Board of Guardians had advertised for they determined upon offering an Increase to the Salary, which they did.

Did you take any Pains, when you saw that there was very little Difference between the Sum offered for the Bridgwater District and the House, and the Sum asked by Mr. King, who had been the Medical Officer last Year, to bring the Board and Mr. King to an Agreement upon that Point?

No ; I did not take any particular Pains to bring in any Person. The Board of Guardians

714

of Guardians determined taking the Workhouse and Bridgwater District together, and they fixed 130l. for the Two. According to the Tenders that came in it was 97l. and 50l., and therefore there was that Difference between the Two.

Mr. King's Offer would have been 17l. more ?

Mr. King did not offer for the Two. Mr. Parker offered for the Workhouse, and Mr. King for the other.

Did you go again upon the 14th of July ?

I did.

Upon that 14th of July Mr. King had made an Offer for the Bridgwater District at 130l.?

He had.

Was not he elected in the first instance ?

No ; not in the Second Year. Mr. Ward was elected.

Previous to the Election taking place do you remember Mr. King being called in ?

I do.

Do you remember what passed ?

I remember that some Guardians said to Mr. King, "Are you pledged, according to the Rules of the Medical Association, not to speak to any Gentle. man that shall come in the District." He said he was ; but he was put up not. withstanding that, and had a very considerable Number of Guardians to vote for him.

Do you remember the Number in the Division upon that Occasion?

I do not; if it is not stated upon the Minutes I have no Recollection of it.

You did not interfere upon that Occasion ?

I did not. The Board of Guardians had determined to advertise in the London Papers; they did so, and Two Gentlemen came down.

Was it by your Advice that they advertised out of the District?

It was. They first advertised within the District; they could not get any One within the District; and then they said the only Course was to advertise out of the District.

When was it that they advertised within the District?

On the 16th of June the Medical Men would not take the Terms offered. The Board of Guardians then advertised for Tenders. The Medical Men sent in the Tenders. The Board of Guardians considered the Tenders too high; and as they were placed without Medical Officers, I said the only Chance they would have would be to advertise in other Districts.

Would it not have been possible to have had Communication with the Parties in order to see whether they could not make an Arrangement with respect to the Salaries with some of the respectable Medical Gentlemen within the District ?

I spoke to some of the influential Members of the Board of Guardians, and they said it would be utterly impossible, with the Combination that had taken place, to enter into an Arrangement with the Medical Gentlemen.

But in point of fact they did enter into an Arrangement afterwards?

They entered into an Arrangement with some of them. They had, with Mr. Ward, Three Gentlemen not connected with the Medical Association as their Officers. If they had been placed in the Situation of having only the Medical Men belonging to the Association they felt they might next Year be called upon for a further Advance.

Are you aware what the Difference would have been between the last Offers made by the Medical Gentlemen and those at which the Districts are now taken ?

I am not, without making a Calculation. I do not think the Difference would have been very great. They wanted 20s. for every Case of Midwife' unless they were called upon to attend every Case of Midwifery. The usual Practice

715

is in all Country Districts for Females to attend. If they were called upon to attend every Case they would have been satisfied with 10s., so that that would have made a considerable Difference.

Did not the Gentlemen require 20s. for every Case of Midwifery ?

10s. if they were allowed to attend every Case of Midwifery; if not, then 20s. ; but the usual Practice is in all Country Districts for Female Midwives to attend the large Majority of Cases.

Is not 10s. the usual Price?

It is.

When you attended before the Guardians upon the Subject of this Remuneration, the Board of Guardians and the Medical Officers had previously got into a State of Irritation ?

They had ; I did all I could to effect a Reconciliation, but it was quite impossible.

Had Mr. King's Conduct been satisfactory with respect to the Bridgwater District?

I never heard the slightest Complaint.

As you wished to reconcile the Parties, considering that the Difference between Mr. King's Proposal and what was offered was so small, how came it that you did not bring about a Reconciliation between them ?

I used all the Means in my Power; but when there were Fifty or Sixty Gentlemen who had been excited in the Way they had, and who considered this Combination so injurious to them, it was impossible.

You consider it a Combination ?

I do.

From Hostility to the Poor Law System ?

I should not say from Hostility to the Operation of the Poor Law Amendment Act generally, but a Combination in this particular District against the Bridgwater Board of Guardians with reference to Salaries; I should not take it to be any Combination against the Law.

It is in fact an Attempt, by joining together, to increase their Emoluments?

Exactly.

Do not you think it was a little fomented by certain Persons that feel a great Objection to the Law, such as Mr. Bowen?

I have no Means of knowing what Influence Mr. Bowen has with those Medical Gentlemen, but during the first Year of the Union nothing could be more harmonious than the Board of Guardians then, and Mr. Bowen was not a Member.

Do not you think it a Pity, without throwing any Blame whatever upon yourself, that you were not able to be present at the Board of Guardians in the early Part of this Dispute between the Board of Guardians and the Medical Gentlemen?

The very Moment I heard there was a Dispute I fixed the earliest possible Day that I

could do. I did not hear of it at the Time, but as soon as I heard of it I named the earliest possible Day, and wrote by Return of Post to say that I should be there on a particular Day.

Do not you regret not having been able to be there upon the 2d of June, when the original Letter was received?

I should be glad to have been there if I could have been the Means of preventing any unpleasant Consequences, but I am not sure that I should have been able to have done it if I had been there. -

Looking back to the Events which took place upon that 2d Day of June, do you think you should have been able to allay the Irritation ?

I do not think so.

Are you satisfied with the present Rate at which Medical Men are remunerated ?

The Commissioners have given their Sanction to an Increase where it has been

716

desired; and I told the Board of Guardians before, that if from Experience they thought the Medical Men were not sufficiently remunerated I should be happy to recommend the Commissioners to increase their Salaries.

Looking at what the actual Increase has been, in your own Judgment is it now satisfactory, or are the Sums paid to the Medical Men unreasonable?

I can only say that in one of the Districts in the adjoining Union of Taunton the Medical Gentlemen have taken them at a lower Sum. I do not wish to see the Medical Men screwed down, and if they cannot do it for the Sum, I am satisfied it should be increased; but when I find Medical Men, Gentlemen of Respectability, offering to do it for less, I am at a loss to know what to say.

Did you ever ask those Medical Gentlemen what their Motive is for taking them at so low a Sum ?

I have not. I told this Mr. Rendell when I saw him that I thought his Conduct was not strictly professional ; that the Amount of Salary was not more than a fair Compensation for the Medical Officer's Time, and that I thought it was not professional to undersell his Profession. -

You have no Means of judging whether it is a fair Remuneration?

It is a most difficult Thing to say what is and what is not a fair Remuneration, I was in hopes that throughout my District we should have gone on quietly till the Inquiry had taken place

in the House of Commons, and on its Determination I hoped that then some satisfactory Arrangement would be made.

Have not you found universally that it is more difficult to manage the Medical Department than any other under the Board of Guardians?

Certainly, I have. I have found more Difficulties with reference to the Medical Arrangements to give Satisfaction than I have in any other Part of the Arrangements.

As to the Salaries, or as to the Performance of the Duties?

As to the Salaries. And the Medical Gentlemen are called upon to make Returns, and so on, which they find extremely irksome.

Have you found it difficult to enforce their filling up those Forms properly?

Very often.

In the first instance did not Medical Men object to tender, as derogatory to their Character ?

They did ; and the very Reason that I broke off the System of tendering was in consequence of their having expressed an Opinion that it was derogatory to them.

Do not they, generally speaking, complain that their Salaries are much too low ?

I do not think they do.

What do they complain ?

There has been a Difficulty in getting them to fill up their Returns, and in deciding who is, as a Pauper, entitled to Medical Relief, and who is not.

Does not that depend upon the Relieving Officer ?

Yes; but the Relieving Officer finds a Difficulty sometimes in drawing a Distinction. I can illustrate it by this very Case of Bridgwater. It is a Case alluded to in the Medical Pamphlet; the Case of John Cook. In the Evidence of James Newman, at the Bottom of Page 45 : "James Newman, Relieving Officer of the First District of the Bridgwater Union, deposes, that he was applied to between Eight and Nine o'Clock in the Morning, on the 14th of July 1837, by the Wife of John Cook, for an Order to the Medical Officer to attend her Child, named John Cook, who, she stated, was ill with some Disease of the Throat; that he refused this Application, thinking that the Applicant should hire a Surgeon, the Husband being a Shoemaker, and never having been a Pauper since Deponent had been Relieving Officer." That merely shows the Sort of Case. This is an Application for Medical Relief, without Application for any other Relief.

Is not that very frequent?

It is frequent. is very Irregular /

717

They become Paupers by making that Application?

They do.

The State of the Fact with respect to the Remuneration of those Persons seems to be this, that you recommended originally 3d per Head upon the whole Population; that the Medical Officers, upon the 23d of June, offered to take it at 4^od. per Head; that the Board then came to a Resolution to give 4d. a Head, and that that has been settled as the Remuneration.

I believe that is about the Amount.

You were sent down by the Poor Law Commissioners to make Inquiries in consequence of a pamphlet called "Facts connected with the Medical Relief of the Poor in the Bridgwater Union"?

I was.

When you went you did not make Inquiries with respect to the Disputes between the Medical Officers and the Board, but you proceeded to the facts that were contained in that Pamphlet?

That was what I conceived to be the Object of the Commissioners in sending me down.

With respect to the Case of Charlotte Allen,-it is stated that she was a Person who was with Child, and had been unwell; and when she was brought to Bed she was not attended by the Medical Officer, but by a Midwife, and a Day or Two after her Labour she was in a very bad State, and a Medical Officer was asked to attend her; did you make Inquiry into those Circumstances ?

I did.

And these Papers contain the Depositions which were taken by you at that time ?

They do; they were taken on Oath.

When you made this Examination did you inquire of Mr. Ruddock ?

No, I did not. -

Why did not you call Mr. Ruddock before you ?

The Reason was that the Pamphlet altogether was considered to be extremely libellous, and I thought that if I had used the Power intrusted to me by examining those Persons as to the Truth of the Pamphlet I should have been exercising my Power inquisitorially, and therefore I took the Case for the Prosecution, if I may so call it, from the Medical Pamphlet, and the Evidence I took was merely as a Defence of the Union.

Did you think you were likely to get to the Truth of it without having both Parties brought before you?

I thought I should get the Truth of the Case as to the Neglect of the Officers, and the Neglect of the Authorities. As to the Medical Part of the Subject, I felt it extremely difficult to enter into from the Nature of the Disease; I could be no Judge upon that Point; the Medical Men had made their State ment of what it was, and I got the Answer of the Relieving Officer as to the Neglect of Duty with which they were charged.

Must not the Evidence necessarily be very incomplete, because you had not the Facts upon the other Side verified on Oath in the same Way ?

We had only one Side upon Oath, and I have stated in my Report that I felt a Delicacy in examining those Medical Gentlemen upon Oath.

You might have called them, and asked them if they chose to be examined?

I might have done so.

Would not it have been proper for you to do so, as they were in a measure attacked?

I think they were the Persons that attacked the Board of Guardians, and they were not measured in their Attacks. I did not feel that it was necessary for me to do that. I have stated my Reason for the Course I took in the Report, that "as all the Medical Men are Members of the Association from which this Pamphlet has emanated, I refused to examine them, although requested by Two or Three Members of the Board of Guardians to do so, under the strong Conviction, that, had I adopted that Course, a good deal of Newspaper. Thunder would

718

have been levelled at me for using inquisitorial - Powers in calling on the Authors and Publishers of Pamphlets to verify their Statements on Oath." I gave that Reason to the Commissioners.

Was not it giving the Accusers rather Advantage, by taking their Accusation, not given on Oath, as valid, and answering it by Depositions?

I thought so ; and the Evidence I took was not intended to be published; I was not aware that it was to be made public; it was a mere Report to the Poor Law Commissioners of Evidence in answer to the Pamphlet. I called upon the Board of Guardians to refute the Allegations in the Pamphlet, which we considered to be the Case for the Prosecution.

Were the Authors of this Pamphlet present to hear the Evidence?

They were not.

Is that the proper Mode of conducting an Inquiry, where the Person who is most capable of enabling you

to get at the Truth is not present?

There was no Representative of the Guardians present with the Medical Men, nor were they aware of the Medical Men issuing this Pamphlet traducing their Character.

In any Inquiry do not you think it necessary to have all the Parties affected by it present?

I did not conceive so; and upon further Consideration I think the Course I took was a judicious one. I may be wrong; but the Board of Guardians felt that this Pamphlet was an extremely libellous one. I might have taken the Examination of it upon myself, but I am sure that would not have been satisfactory.

The Object of your Examination was, first, to inquire into the Facts, to enable the Poor Law Commissioners to judge of the Conduct of the Officers, and it was still open to any Person that thought that from Neglect of the Officers of the Union this Woman had been materially injured to proceed by Law against them?

Certainly.

It did not close the Inquiry, but it was only for the Satisfaction of the Commissioners?

Exactly. I sent the Pamphlet to the Commissioners, appended to my Re port, and I said that was the Case for the Prosecution, and that the Evidence I sent were the Answers of the Board of Guardians and the Officers.

The Result, in one Case, could have been the Punishment of the Officers, but in the other there could be no Punishment of the Persons that brought the Accusation?

None.

Are you aware that a great Number of the Facts, far beyond what is stated in that Pamphlet, that appear in these Depositions, are totally denied by the Medical Officer, Mr. Ruddock?

I am not in the least aware. I have had no Conversation with Mr. Ruddock upon the Subject.

What was the Use to be made of this Examination?

Merely for the Purpose of submitting this Examination to the Poor Law Commissioners, as the Answer of the Board of Guardians to the Accusation made against it.

Then would not it have been as well to have had those who made the Accusation before you?

I took their Case to be according to their own Pamphlet.

When you heard that Evidence against their Case did not you think it important that those that had made the Accusation should know what was said in ^a

to it, and that they should have an Opportunity of replying to that?

No; I did not think that was the Way in which I was to examine into the Case. Certain Complaints were made against the Officers of the Union; I took the Case as it was charged against them; and I said, "What have you to say

719

in answer?" I did not admit Reporters to be present—Persons for the Purpose of disseminating this. If I had done that I should have thought that I might have been doing an Injury to the Medical Men.

If you had a Complaint made against a Servant of yours by another Gentleman, should you think it necessary, when you inquired into the Misconduct of that Servant, to summon that Gentleman into your Room, that he might make the Accusation?

Certainly not.

But you would either discharge the Servant or keep the Servant, according as you found that he answered the Accusation satisfactorily or not?

Certainly. If the Board of Guardians had made Complaints against the Medical Officer for any Neglect of Duty I should have then considered myself bound to call the Medical Officer before me, that he might have heard the Nature of the Complaint against him. I should have given him an Opportunity of cross examining all the Witnesses, and of bringing forward Witnesses in his Defence; but here there is nothing to bring the Medical Officers under the Condemnation of the Commissioners.

But in your Report you impute Blame to them. You say, "I am far from wishing to speak in any way disrespectfully of the Members of a liberal Profession, or to impute unworthy Motives to them; but the Perusal of the Evidence, I must confess, has left a strong Impression on my Mind that the Medical Gentlemen, when the Guardians were in Difficulties, endeavoured to embarrass them as much as possible, and that they have in their Pamphlet endeavoured to traduce and vilify a Body of Men who have at all Times evinced the strongest Desire to perform their important Duties in a fair and independent Manner." Now is not that rather a strong Charge against these Medical Gentlemen?

I have taken the Evidence of the Medical Men, as given in their Pamphlet, and upon that I have said this.

Was not that a private Communication that you made to the Persons that employed you, upon your Examination of the whole Subject?

It was a Report to the Poor Law Commissioners upon this Subject.

Then you conceived that it was a private Communication?

It is officially reported to the Poor Law Commissioners; it was never intended for the Public.

Before you imputed that to them, would not it have been as well to have had them in, and to have stated that such was the Impression upon your Mind?

They have made against the Board of Guardians Imputations much stronger than any of these in the Pamphlet which they put forward to the World. This is merely given as a Review of my Proceedings.

They have not had an Opportunity of hearing the Evidence in Defence, or of cross-examining the Witnesses, and therefore does it not appear that you were not in a Position to give an Opinion at all upon the Subject ?

I took their Pamphlet as their Case. The Guardians had certainly not an Opportunity of becoming acquainted with it before it was made public; but this Report never was made public.

Was this Report of yours communicated to the Board of Guardians? Certainly not; the Evidence was given to the Board of Guardians, but not the Report.

If you think that the Board of Guardians had Reason to complain of the Manner in which their Conduct was observed upon, by this Pamphlet, stating Facts against them, do not you think that the Medical Men had some Right to complain of you, behind their Backs, making such a Report of them to the Commissioners ?

The Medical Men who avowed themselves as the Authors of this Pamphlet were not the Medical Officers of the Union at all. The Persons that avowed themselves as the Authors of this Pamphlet were Three Medical Men not belonging to the Union.

720

You have published as a Part of your Report a Resolution of the Board of Guardians; now surely the Board of Guardians must have been informed of what you were doing? Were the Board of Guardians present?

Yes; the whole Board of Guardians were present at the Inquiry. The Commissioners sent down a Letter to the Board of Guardians to beg them to give them some Answers to the Questions.

And they produced those Witnesses ?

Those Witnesses were produced.

Do not you think it would have been as well that the Persons who had written the Charge which those Witnesses were to answer should have been present, and have had the Opportunity of hearing what Answer they gave ?

I have already said that I do not think so.

And you thought it right, without their being present, that you should forward this Resolution of the Board of Guardians to the Poor Law Commissioners?

Exactly so. We had heard the whole Pamphlet read, and we heard the Answer to it. The Board of Guardians took the Pamphlet as the Case for the Prosecution, and Evidence was given for the Defence. I would not take the Evidence of the Defence except upon Oath; but I took the other as it was, without calling upon any Person to verify it.

No one being present on behalf of the Medical Gentlemen to hear the Evidence, and cross-examine the Witnesses ?

And no one being present on behalf of the Board of Guardians to see this Pamphlet before it is sent into the World.

Is it very usual for a Person who writes a Libel to send to the Person libelled before he sends it to the Press?

I do not think it is, though it would be a very useful Thing if it were done.

Would it not have been a different Thing if the Report had been made by those Parties, instead of being made by you ?

The Board of Guardians expressed their Opinion by a separate Resolution, and my Report was never read to the Board of Guardians. It was my Communication to the Commissioners, without any Expectation when it was written that it would ever have gone beyond the Commissioners.

That Paragraph in which you say, "I am far from wishing to speak," and so forth, was never communicated to the Board of Guardians?

Not at all.

Nor sent forth to the Public till it was called for by Parliament?

Never. The first Day of our Inquiry that Pamphlet was considered as an anonymous one. It was not till we had commenced our Proceedings on the Second Day that we knew who were the Authors.

You were sent down by your Superiors, your Masters, (if that Expression may be used,) to make an Inquiry into the Conduct of the Officers, and you did make that Inquiry; that Inquiry was made before

the Board of Guardians, but your own Opinion upon the Conduct of the Parties concerned was given in a private Report from you to your Superiors?

It was. It is not to be found any where in the Books of the Union, nor was the Board of Guardians in possession of it till it was printed by Order of Parliament.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

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

YOU are the Relieving Officer of the Second District of the Bridgwater Union ? -

I am.

What is that Second District called ?

Huntspill and Polden Hill District'

721

Did not you order Mr. Caswell to attend upon certain Days upon a Child of a Man named Reynolds

I did.

Was he attended?

He was.

On the 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th of June 1837.?

Yes. *

That was at the Time the Medical Officers were paid as for private Patients?

It was.

Had you received any Directions from the Board of Guardians with respect to f^o upon the Medical Officer to attend the Paupers at that Time?

Yes

What were your Orders ? -

I had Orders to act with Discretion in giving Medical Relief.

What did you understand by that ?

That we were not to give Relief to every one that applied.

To be careful how you did do so ?

Yes.

Were there many Persons that applied to you during that Time to whom you took upon yourself, using that Discretion, to refuse the Order ?

I do not know that I refused any one. I never had any Application except from those Paupers that were in the Receipt of Parochial Relief, or from very few.

Are you sure that you had no Application but from those that had received Parochial Relief?

I had from a few others.

Was this Child attended regularly up to the Time of its Death ?

No, it was not.

How long before its Death had the Attendance ceased ?

I gave Mr. Caswell an Order to discontinue his Attendance on Saturday, and on the Tuesday following I gave him an Order to continue his Attendance.

Do you recollect what Day of the Month the Saturday was ?

The 1st of July.

And then, upon the 4th, you gave an Order to attend again?

I did.

What made you give any Order not to attend upon the 1st of July ?

Because I considered his Attendance was not required every Day to see the Child.

How did you know that?

He told me in the first Onset, when I gave him the Order, that he could do the Child no Good, nor all the Surgeons in England.

Though he could not save the Child's Life, might not he have relieved its Sufferings ?

He told me he could do him no Good.

Upon that you took upon yourself to say, "Do not attend him." ?

Yes, I did, having received Instructions from the Board to that Effect.

He returned, however, upon the 4th of July ?

He did.

Did he report to you or do you know how he found the Child at that Time ?

He reported to the Board once a Week. By his Book I saw his Report was, "Not in immediate Danger, but will never recover."

722

What is the Date of that?

I do not know.

How came you to order him to visit the Child again upon the 4th?

He said to me that I had no Right to give him an Order to discontinue his Attendance, and consequently I gave him an Order to attend again.

It was in consequence of his Remonstrance that you gave him the Order?

Yes.

Did he tell you that the Child was in a State that was not right to be left?

He did not then.

Did he afterwards?

He told me that I should not take upon myself the Responsibility to give him an Order to discontinue his Attendance, and I told him I had not.

Do you know when the Child died?

I do not know the exact Day.

Did he die soon after that Time?

He was reported the Friday following to be dead.

With respect to Coles and Millard, you prevented Mr. Caswell from attending them?

I did.

What made you do that?

I called to see them upon the Saturday Morning; they told me they did not require to see him so often; and they had Medicine sufficient for Two or Three Days.

Do you know what was the Matter with them?

I believe it was reported to be from intermittent Fever.

How do you know they did not require Assistance?

They told me so themselves.

Do you think you were a Judge merely from their telling you whether they required Assistance?

No, I was no Judge of it.

Supposing you had not received that Direction to be cautious how you gave Orders, should you have ordered him to discontinue Attendance upon them?

I do not think I should.

Then it was in consequence of the Order you received from the Board of Guardians that you gave him the Order to discontinue the Attendance?

Yes; and upon the Information I received from the Paupers themselves,

Was not he to be paid for the Work he did, instead of being paid so much Salary?

He was to be paid as for private Patients.

During that Period Mr. Caswell had been much more active in visiting Paupers than he was when he was employed by the Board at a Salary?

I believe he had.

Was there a great Increase of Illness during that Time?

I do not know that there was any great Increase.

Was there any Increase?

There were a great many Paupers upon the Lists before the Contract expired.

Did not that List increase extremely after the Contract expired?

I do not know that it did increase; he had paid his Visits more frequently.

When he charged per Visit, his Visits were much more frequent?

Yes

You are sure of that?

I could perceive that by his Report Book.

722

What is the Date of that?

- I do not know.

How came you to order him to visit the Child again upon the 4th?

He said to me that I had no Right to give him an Order to discontinue his Attendance, and consequently I gave him an Order to attend again.

It was in consequence of his Remonstrance that you gave him the Order?

Yes.

Did he tell you that the Child was in a State that was not right to be left?

He did not then.

Did he afterwards?

He told me that I should not take upon myself the Responsibility to give him an Order to discontinue his Attendance, and I told him I had not.

Do you know when the Child died?

I do not know the exact Day.

Did he die soon after that Time?

He was reported the Friday following to be dead.

With respect to Coles and Millard, you prevented Mr. Caswell from attending them?

I did.

What made you do that?

I called to see them upon the Saturday Morning; they told me they did not require to see him so often; and they had Medicine sufficient for Two or Three Days.

Do you know what was the Matter with them?

I believe it was reported to be from intermittent Fever.

How do you know they did not require Assistance?

They told me so themselves.

Do you think you were a Judge merely from their telling you whether they required Assistance ?

No, I was no Judge of it.

Supposing you had not received that Direction to be cautious how you gave Orders, should you have ordered him to discontinue Attendance upon them?

I do not think I should.

Then it was in consequence of the Order you received from the Board of Guardians that you gave him the Order to discontinue the Attendance?

Yes; and upon the Information I received from the Paupers themselves,

Was not he to be paid for the Work he did, instead of being paid so much Salary ?

He was to be paid as for private Patients.

During that Period Mr. Caswell had been much more active in visiting Paupers than he was when he was employed by the Board at a Salary?

I believe he had.

Was there a great Increase of Illness during that Time?

I do not know that there was any great Increase.

Was there any Increase ?

There were a great many Paupers upon the Lists before the Contract expired.

Did not that List increase extremely after the Contract expired ?

I do not know that it did increase; he had paid his Visits more frequently.

When he charged per Visit, his Visits were much more frequent?

Yes

You are sure of that?

I could perceive that by his Report Book.

his Assistance so often.

Did they appear to you to be well?

They did not appear to me to be well; they appeared to be better.

But still ill ?

Yes.

They did not appear to you to require daily Attendance?

They did not.

Do you think you are a good Judge upon that ?

Yes

Do you believe they would have had daily Attendance if it had been during the Contract ?

I am quite sure they would not.

Were they ever neglected during the Contract?

They were never neglected.

You think they were always attended when it was necessary that they should be attended ?

They were ; in similar Cases to those they were generally attended once or twice a Week.

And after the Contract was at an end, and they were paid for as other Patients, the Attendance was much more frequent?

Yes.

You thought it necessary to check that?

I did.

Is it not a bad Thing then for the Poor to do it by Contract, if it is the Interest of the Medical Men not to be so active in doing their Duty ?

I do not know that.

Do not the Board of Guardians take care that the Medical Men do do their Duty?

They do.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

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

You told him to discontinue the Attendance upon Coles and Millard because they said they did not require any Attendance; of course when a Paupertold you he was well you did not send a Medical Man to him?

I did not.

And upon their telling you that they were recovered you did not send a Medical Man to see that they were recovered?

No.

Did they tell you they were recovered ?

No ; they told me that they did not require