

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

1

753

Die Martis, 26^o Junii 1838.

The Lord WHARNCLIFFE in the Chair..

Evidence on the Operation of the Poor Law
Amendment Act.

Mr. JONATHAN TOOGOOD is called in, and
makes the following Statement :

There were some Questions I was asked
Yesterday which I could not answer correctly. I
have since referred to Documents, and can
answer them more distinctly now. I was asked
whether I could state that the Sixteen People
who had died in the Union House had not been
Patients in the Bridgwater Infirmary, and had
not been discharged from thence; I have gone
through the List since, and can positively assert
that none of them were ever Patients in the
Bridgwater Infirmary; the great Majority were
Children, who were inadmissible from their
Age.

*Do you know how many Persons there are now in
the Workhouse at Bridgwater?*

I do not.

*You observe the Return of the Deaths takes in
more than March and April?*

It takes in Two Months; I have not gone
through it so exactly as that; but I speak of
Sixteen Deaths. On the Case of Charlotte Allen I
have found the Papers which I promised I
would bring To - day, the Letters from Mr. King
and Mr. Ruddock on which I founded the
Statement in my Pamphlet.

What is the Date of this Paper?

November the 1st, 1837. Perhaps I ought to
state that in order to be strictly correct, after
having read that Letter, I sent a Messenger
purposely to Mr. King with a Copy of the
Pamphlet, asking whether the Case was
correctly stated or not, and I received his
Answer, which I hold now in my Hand, in
which he says it is rather underdrawn than
overdrawn.

*Does Inflammation of the Womb produce
Puerperal Fever?*

Not always.

Does it ever?

Yes.

*Is not a Fever produced by Inflammation of the
Womb or Laceration of the Womb called by another
Name?*

Childbed Fever.

Is it not called Peritonitis?

Peritonitis in a Puerperal Woman is the same
Thing, but Men are subject to Peritonitis also.

*You hold that in a Woman Puerperal Fever and
Peritonitis are the same Thing?*

During Parturition.

*If a Medical Man were to tell you that a Woman
was ill of Peritonitis you would consider it Puerperal
Fever?*

Yes.

*If he were to tell you she was ill of Puerperal Fever
you would consider it a Case of Peritonitis?*

Yes.

*Are there not particular Marks attending
Puerperal Fever?*

In some Cases there are; there is always one
distinguishing Mark.

754 *What is that?*

Extreme Tenderness of the whole Abdomen, a
very rapid Pulse, and great Depression.

Does not that come on immediately after Deliver?

Not always.

Is it not highly infectious?

Not always.

It is occasionally highly infectious?

In Hospitals.

How soon after Delivery does that come on?

At very uncertain Periods; sometimes within
Twenty - four Hours; it may come on at any
Time during the Puerperal Month, that is, the
Month of Parturition.

The Month next subsequent to Delivery?

Yes.

*You are understood to say that Puerperal Fever may
come on at any Time during the Month of Delivery?*

Yes.

*You are understood to say that Puerperal Fever and
Peritonitis are the same Thing?*

In that State; in a parturient State.

*The Question refers to a Woman in Childbirth; you
say that Puerperal Fever is not always infectious, and
may come on at any Time within a Month?*

Yes.

*Hysteritis Simplex is a small Laceration of the
Womb?*

Inflammation, not Laceration.

*If this Woman was seized with Puerperal Fever it
would be a much more serious Complaint than
Hysteritis Simplex?*

Hysteritis Simplex is not so dangerous a Disease
as Puerperal Fever.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

2

Should not you suppose that a Medical Man who made a Return of the Maladies of his Patients would put down the most serious and grave Malady?

I do not know how that would be with others.

Should not you?

In the Infirmary I never put down their Diseases.

If you made a weekly Return of the Maladies of your Patients, and a Woman had Hysteritis Simplex and likewise Puerperal Fever, should you return the smaller Disease and not the Puerperal Fever?

I believe the Entries in the Books are very little to be depended upon; indeed, I know that they are not; I have seen the most absurd Entries in the Books from some of the Medical Officers.

Not calculated to mislead the Board?

No, not to mislead the Board; but they are called upon to name the Disease when a Patient is taken ill. The Disease may not be fully developed for Three or Four Days or a Week, and may turn out something they did not expect; for instance, an Attack of Ague, you do not know what it is at first.

You hold that if this Woman was in the State in which she was described by this Gentleman to you, to be suffering from a dreadful Laceration and Prolapsus of the Womb, the Malady was not only irremediable but must render the Remainder of her Existence miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to those around her?

From the Papers I have been furnished with I apprehend that was her State.

From the Representation of these Gentlemen, you consider that her State was irremediable, and that her Life during the Remainder of her Existence must be miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to those around her?

I did at the Time of the drawing up of that Pamphlet; and I beg again to repeat, that I 755 might not overcharge the Case, I sent the Pamphlet by my Ser. Mr. J. Toogood. vant to Mr. King, to ask whether the Case was fairly and properly represented; and I have his Answer in my Hand, delivered at the Time.

Then, if her Malady is cured, and she is not miserable to herself or intolerably offensive to those around her, you apprehend the Case was misrepresented?

I have no Doubt, from the Statement Mr. King and Mr. Ruddock made to me, that she had Puerperal Fever. I have no Doubt that she had Prolapsus of the Uterus. I have no Doubt that she had and still has Laceration of the

Perinæum.

That being your Opinion, which you have stated in your Pamphlet, supposing that the Malady is remedied, and supposing the Existence of the Woman is not miserable, and that she is not intolerably offensive to those around her, either your Opinion must have been wrong, or the Case must have been misrepresented to you?

That can only apply to the State of the Laceration of the Perinæum, because she must have recovered of the Puerperal Fever, or died of it. The Prolapsus Uteri is a curable Disease; but the Laceration of the Perinæum, if it goes into the Rectum, is very rarely a curable Disease. I have never known but One Instance of it in my Life.

Her Case was represented to you, and you, as a Medical Man of great Experience and Skill, have stated that her Case is not only irremediable but must render the Remainder of her Existence miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to those around her, and you stated that from the Representation made to you. Suppose the Case is remedied, and suppose that her Existence is not miserable to herself, and that she is not intolerably offensive to those around her, the Case must have been misrepresented to you?

I do not think it was misrepresented to me at the Time.

You know nothing about the Woman's present State?

No, not of my own Knowledge.

You state in the Pamphlet that this Woman "has suffered, from the Violence of her Labour and the Unskilfulness of the Midwife, a dreadful Laceration and a Prolapsus of the Womb, which is not only irremediable, but must render the Remainder of her Existence miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to those around her." If those Consequences do not follow, if the Malady is remedied, and if the Remainder of her Existence has not continued to be miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to those around her, is it not certain either that you were mistaken in your Opinion, or that the Case was misrepresented to you?

If such be the Case; but that is not the Fact I know from a Man of the highest Reputation who examined her.

Do you know that of your own Knowledge?

I state it on as good Authority as many Things I have stated here.

You are not asked whether it is the Fact or not; but supposing that it is the Fact is it not clear you are mistaken in the Opinion you have delivered in this Pamphlet, or that the Case was misrepresented to you?

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

3

If the Woman is well it is.

The Laceration of the Perinæum you conceive cannot be remedied?

I should think not at this Distance of Time. I have never known but One Instance of Recovery in my Life, and then it took place within a Month of Parturition. I have seen many Cases which continue to this Day.

It was upon the Result of those Cases you gave that Opinion?

Yes; understanding at the Time that the Laceration had extended to the Rectum.

By whom was that stated to you?

First by Mr. King and Mr. Ruddock, and then by Mr. Standert.

756 *Has he seen the Woman lately?*

He saw her on the 14th of February last, Six or Seven Months after the Delivery; I believe he can speak only to the precise State of the Perinæum at that Time, the Date of the Pamphlet being in November.

The Opinion you gave with respect to her being likely to be in a State offensive to others rested upon the Notion you had as to the Extent of the Laceration?

Precisely.

If the Laceration extended to the Rectum you thought she would be permanently offensive to others?

I have no Doubt of that. And, from the Statement you made, you considered that to be her State? I had no Doubt of it.

Did you mean permanently offensive?

I understood so at the Time the Pamphlet was drawn up.

Not at Returns, but at all Periods?

Yes; that was my Opinion.

That she would be permanently and always offensive as was represented to you?

She would be more or less offensive, but to a Degree she would be always offensive.

If she is not always offensive then you are misinformed?

If there is a Discharge from it then she must be offensive.

If she is not offensive then you must have been misinformed?

There must be some Mistake if she was not always offensive to some Degree.

Then it was either misrepresented to you, or you misjudged?

Yes.

There are Two Complaints, one you state to be remediable, and the other not?

Yes.

The Prolapsus Uteri you consider remediable?

Yes.

The Laceration of the Perinæum you consider is not curable if it extends to the Rectum?

Very rarely. In very small Women in their first Labour there is sometimes a slight Laceration in the Part within the Vagina called the Fourchette, which gives way just as the Head passes; that is a Matter of no Consequence; that is not a Laceration of the Perinæum.

If it is what is properly described as a Laceration of the Perinæum, that, generally speaking, you consider not remediable?

I am sure it is not.

You believe the offensive Smell not entirely removeable, though it may be greater or less?

Yes, according to the State of the Bowels. I know an Instance at this Moment of a Lady who suffered the same Accident many Years ago, who has been obliged ever since to wear a Plug; she is not able to go into Company in consequence. It is one of the most lamentable Things that can happen to a Person.

Do you know the Midwife?

I do not.

Have the Female Midwives in general Skill to ascertain whether one or other of these Maladies has occurred?

They know nothing about it; they are only fit to sit by the Bedside, and wait and receive the **757** and receive the Child. They do not, in many Instances, know how to tie the Funis properly.

Was not it absolutely necessary, to save the Life of this Woman, that a Medical Man should be called in?

Yes; I believe her Life was saved by Mr. Ruddock and Mr. King being called in.

The Result to this Woman, and the Danger in which she was in of her Life, and those Consequences ensuing which you have stated in this Pamphlet, were in your Opinion owing to her not having been attended by a Medical Man on that Occasion?

I think there would have been much less Chance of it. It is possible she might have had a Prolapsus of the Uterus, and even a Laceration of the Perinæum, but I do not think it is probable.

Is it your Opinion those Things were produced by

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

4

Want of Skill on the Part of the Midwife?

I think if she had had Attendants with better Skill they would not have occurred.

Such Cases do occur with a most skilful Man, do they not?

I have practised very extensively between Thirty and Forty Years, and have sometimes delivered about 200 Women in a Year, and I never had such a Case occur but once.

Does not Prolapsus of the Uterus occur occasionally without any Fault at all?

Certainly not.

Nor Laceration of the Womb?

No, certainly not.

You mean to say that wherever there is Prolapsus of the Womb, or wherever there is Laceration of the Perinæum, it is a Proof that there was Want of Skill?

Not in all Cases.

Then it does happen sometimes, where the Practitioner is skilful?

I never knew the same Thing occur in any Instance in my Life. I have known lacerations to a small Extent occur with Medical Men. I never saw one to any considerable Extent in my Life where there was due Skill.

Does not it occur sometimes, notwithstanding the Skill of the Medical Practitioner?

It may; I cannot speak to the Skill of other Men. In the Case I alluded to particularly it proceeded from Unskilfulness on the Part of the Medical Man who was attending.

Is that the only Instance you have known?

No; I know another Case where it arose from Unskilfulness.

Have you ever known any other Case?

I recollect a Case which occurred by Accident, but not from Unskilfulness.

Was it in skilful Hands?

Yes.

Then such a Case may occur from Accident in skilful Hands?

I will explain how that occurred : it was during the Application of Instruments; the Woman was not properly secured. The Party applying the Instrument had considered that she was a Woman of great Resolution, and it proved at a Moment of great Pain that she was not. There was some Neglect in securing her; and unfortunately she made a Spring when the Forceps were in action, which produced Laceration, but it healed.

Whether from Accident or from some other Circumstance, such Things do occur, even when the

Medical Attendant is skilful?

Sometimes; very rarely,

758 *How many have you known in Forty Years?*

One or Two.

Is there any other Case at Woollavington you wish to produce as proving the Facts stated in your Pamphlet?

I beg to refer to the Case of Mrs. Good to prove that the Overseers Orders are of no avail. The Facts of the Case are very strong.

Do you know the Reason why the Order for the Medical Man was not attended to?

I have a Letter from the Board refusing the Payment : " Gentlemen, Your Bill, amounting to 2/ 2s., directed to the Parish of Woollavington, stated to be for Attendance and Delivery of Good's Wife in consultation with Mr. Caswell, was Yesterday laid before the Board and read; I was thereupon instructed to inform you that the Board do not consider themselves empowered to order the Payment of the same. " Dated the 17th March 1838.

Do you know Good?

I attended her.

What is her Husband?

A Pauper.

Do you mean that he was a Pauper in the strict Sense of the Term?

Yes, and that Mr. Caswell had an Order from the Relieving Officer to attend this Woman in Labour. When he came he suspected it would be a dangerous Case, and he applied to the Guardian of the Parish for Assistance if he should require it in the course of the Night. Delay took place.

This was long subsequent to the Payment for independent Business?

Yes; but I tender it as a Proof of Neglect on the Part of the Parish Officers. On the following Day, between Twelve and One o'Clock, Mr. Caswell procured an Order from the Overseers, " To Mr. Toogood : Mr. Caswell reports to us a Case of Labour in our Parish which he has been up with all Night as being of a very serious Character, and as being absolutely necessary for the Aid of a second Surgeon. We the Overseers agree to see him paid. Woollavington, 16th December 1837. G. Ralls, J. Knight, Overseers. Patient, John Good's Wife. "

To whom is it directed?

To me.

You were not one of the Surgeons?

No; I went on Consultation when I came to see this Woman. I got there about Half past Two, it being Four Miles off. I found the Woman in a

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

5

dying State; I thought it hardly possible she would survive her Delivery; she had had a most alarming Hæmorrhage. For some Hours she did survive her Delivery, but died the following Morning. I believe if that Woman had had prompt and efficient Assistance some Hours before, her Life would have been saved.

Do you know that she had not prompt Assistance?

Yes, it was a Presentation of the Placenta, which is a most dangerous Case of Midwifery, and which requires most prompt Assistance, in which no Surgeon, if he can avail himself of a second Opinion, would act alone. After my long Experience I would get a second Opinion if I could, for it is not uncommon for a Person to die under Delivery, the Hæmorrhage is so great.

How do you know that she had not prompt Assistance?

She was not delivered.

Who was it that delivered her?

Mr. Caswell.

Did he immediately represent the State of the Thing, and require Assistance?

They would not give him the Order.

To whom did he apply?

First to a Guardian, and then to the Overseers. He applied at Five O'Clock on Friday, and did not get it till One o'Clock on Saturday.

759 *Mr. Caswell was a Surgeon fully competent to Cases of that Kind, was not he?*

I have frequently met him in Cases in Consultation, and have always found him a very skilful man. I have had the Assurances of the Clergymen and Parish Officers that he was a Man of Skill and Kindness.

Why was not she delivered?

I presume Mr. Caswell did not choose to undertake so dangerous an Operation alone. I would not, even after my long Experience, if I could get a Friend to aid me with his Advice.

Was not it very likely that the poor Woman might die in the intermediate Time?

Yes; she was virtually dead; she had no Pulse when I came.

Do you think if another Medical Man had been called in on the Friday that her Life might have been saved?

I have no Doubt of the Fact. He thought he felt the Placenta presenting, but the Labour was not sufficiently advanced.

Because he thought it peculiarly dangerous to the

Woman he wanted further Advice?

Yes; he took the Alarm in the earliest possible Stage.

That Assistance was not given him till it was too late to do any Good?

Certainly not.

This has no reference to your Pamphlet?

No; but it has reference to the Correspondence.

What did you do in consequence of the Refusal; did you appeal to the Poor Law Commissioners?

I merely sent an Account to the Board of Guardians, and received their Answer refusing Payment. I have done nothing since. I know it is not the Practice in the neighbouring Unions. In the Williton Union, in which Captain Luttrell is Chairman, whenever a second Opinion is required the Surgeon has been paid the usual Charge of Two Guineas.

Have the goodness to refer to that Part of the Correspondence to which it has reference?

I am afraid I cannot now point out that Part of the Correspondence to which it may have reference.

Your Statement is, that the Woman's Life was lost in consequence of the Neglect of the Overseers?

That is my Opinion; and there are other Cases in which I think the same Result has followed the same Line of Conduct. There was the Case of a Woman at Grenton, where the Clergyman was so alarmed that he came over for my Son.

The Woman was not in Labour when your Son went to her?

No, but the Women all believed her to be in Labour; but the Relieving Officer met my Son on the Road, and told him to go on.

Did the Practice of refusing to pay Medical Men who were applied to to give their Advice in Consultation prevent Men, in the Period to which your Pamphlet applies, from attending?

I am not sure that it prevented them. I have never been asked to attend myself; but I have gone, on some Occasions, without any Expectation of Payment. If I had received the Directions of the Overseers I should have expected to be paid. I considered that when I had the Order of the Overseers the Board of Guardians would pay me.

Is it not likely that Injury would arise to the Poor if it was known that the Board of Guardians refused Payment of such Cases?

Yes. I believe Mr. King on one Case refused to go; that was a Woman of the Name of Tuttiett,

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

6

who, in consequence of the Medical Man not attending in proper Time, died.

760 *You know that from the Information of the Surgeon, not your own Knowledge?*

I have the Statement of the Husband and the Women who were around her, and the Surgeon who attended her. I beg to say my only Object has been to amend the Law.

You are not very friendly to the Law, are you?

I have not been friendly to the Medical Administration of the Law, but I am not an Enemy to the Principle of the Law.

You are in considerable Practice in the Neighbourhood; was there a great Increase of Illness in that Neighbourhood between the 26th of June and the 18th of August?

I cannot say without having my Books here.

You cannot recollect that there was?

My Practice was very fluctuating; I did not hear that there was any Epidemic.

There was no Influenza at that Time?

I really cannot state without having my Books with me.

Were not the Deaths in the Workhouse greatly out of Proportion to those in the surrounding Country?

Most certainly.

Mr. Parker is a Surgeon at Bridgwater, but not one of the Medical Officers of the Board of Guardians?

He is not.

Do you know any thing of the Case of a Man of the Name of John Cook, Mount Terrace, Pig Cross, Bridgwater?

Yes.

Will you have the goodness to state the Circumstances of that Case which have come to your Knowledge?

I met Mr. Parker, the Surgeon, near the Bridge at Bridgwater, I believe, on the Friday Morning, who told me he had been to see a Child of Cook's who was very ill of the Croup.

Do you know John Cook?

Yes, I do.

What is he?

He is a Shoemaker.

Is he a Pauper?

Yes; he has had Parochial Medical Relief for Years past.

Up to this Time?

I believe to this present Time.

Since the Establishment of the Union?

Oh yes, certainly, I understand. I am provided with Proof of that.

Do you know of your own Knowledge what is the Average of his Earnings?

I know that the Man has been attended by the Parish Surgeons; I have received the Information from the Parish Surgeons themselves.

Which of them?

From Mr. Poole and from Mr. King.

Since the Formation of the Union, or before?

I believe since the Formation of the Union.

Mr. Newman, the Relieving Officer, can probably speak to that?

Mr. Newman's Statement is not quite correct here. The Facts of the Case were these : the Woman applied to Mr. King in the Morning, and asked him to see that Child; he, knowing that she was a Pauper, referred her to the Relieving Officer; the Relieving Officer refused her an Order. She then applied to Mr. Parker, whom she saw, I believe by Accident, passing near her House, and offered him, I think, 2s, or 3s., or some such Sum, which she had raised by **761** pawning some of her Goods, if he would attend her Child; he did attend her Child, and directed her to apply to the Board of Guardians, and he wrote a Letter himself to the Board.

Which Letter you have inserted in your Pamphlet?

Yes; here is a copy of the Letter, which was retained.

What is the Date of it?

The 14th of July.

Do you know of Mr. King having received an Order between Twelve and One o'Clock on that Day?

I was with Mr. King in the Street at the Time that he received that Order.

Do you know what Mr. King did?

He instantly went to see it, and returned and told me the Child was dying; and it died the same Afternoon.

Had that Child been attended earlier is it likely it would have been saved?

It is one of the most dangerous Diseases, and requires the most prompt Attention.

Is it likely that if the Child had been immediately attended it would have been saved?

I think it very likely would; many Children who are immediately attended to do recover of this Disease.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

7

*These are all the Cases you have presented in your
Pamphlet?*

I beg to state that I have, in confirmation of
this Statement, an Affidavit from Cook's Wife of
the Facts.

The Affidavit is produced.

*What induced that Woman to go and make that
Affidavit?*

I do not know; I was not at home when the
Affidavit was made; I was at a House near Sir
John Slade's at Newton, and when I came home
it was put into my Hand.

Did you suggest it?

I do not know; I might have thought it
necessary for my own Safety to get all the
Information I could, to be quite sure that I was
justified in saying what I did.

The Affidavit is read, and is as follows :
Lucretia Cook, Wife of John Cook of Bridgwater in the
County of Somerset, Shoe maker, maketh Oath, and saith :
For Two or Three Years past Mr. Poole, late the Parish
Surgeon, has from Time to Time attended myself and Child
during Illness; he attended us as Paupers, and on the
Parish Account. My Husband is a Shoemaker, but he has
not constant Work, and his Earnings, together with my
eldest Son's, for the last Six Months have not exceeded on
an Average 8s. per Week; and we have no other Means of
Support. About the Middle of the Month of July last, on a
Thursday Evening, my youngest Child, a Boy aged about
Ten Years, was taken ill, and between Seven and Eight o
Clock on the following Morning (Friday) he became much
worse; at that Time Three of my Children were living at
home with me. About Nine o'Clock in the Morning of the
said Friday I went to Mr. Newman, the Relieving Officer of
the Bridgwater Union, and requested that Medical Relief
might be afforded to my Child; he inquired respecting my
Circumstances, and I recollect telling him that if my
Husband was in constant Work he might earn lli a Week,
but that he seldom had any Work to do; and that I was very
poor, and in great Distress, and not able to pay a Doctor;
and that I had before been attended by the Parish Doctor.
He said that he could not give me a Note, but that I had
better go to Mr. King's, the Surgeon, and try to pay him to
attend the Child : and for the Purpose of procuring Medical
Assistance I carried a Jacket of one of my Sons to Mr.
Smith, the Pawnbroker's, and pledged same for 3s. I then
went to Mr. King's, but he was not home. I afterwards met
him, and asked him to attend my Child; he said he would
come, but that his Charge was 5s. weekly for Attendance
on poor People at their Houses; and I then went home and
sent a Gun to be pawned, and procured 4s. more
afterwards. About Eleven o'Clock I saw Mr. Parker, a
Surgeon, near my House, and requested him to look at my
Child, and he accordingly did so, and immediately give me

some Medicine for my Child, and said he should make no
Charge for it; and he gave me a Note to take to Mr.
Newman. I took the Note to Mr. Newman, and he told me to
come to him in Half an Hour. After he had attended
762 the Board of Guardians, a Neighbour of mine, Mrs.
Ware, went to the Hall and had a Note for Mr. King to
attend, which, she told me, she carried to Mr. King's. Mr.
Newman called in the Morning after Mr. Parker left, but
before Mr. King came, and went up Stairs and saw the
Child, but said nothing to me. About One o'clock in the
Afternoon of the same Day Mr. King attended, and I think
he was there Two or Three Times afterwards in the course
of the Afternoon. The Child, however, got worse, and about
Eleven o'Clock in the Night he died. Before my Child was
buried Mr. Toogood, a Surgeon, sent for me, and I made
him acquainted with my distressed Circumstances, and he
procured me a Donation of 5s.

*With respect to the Salaries, what induces you to
think that the Terms which were offered to Medical
Men were insufficient for the Purpose of Remunera
tion?*

My former Experience of the Labour I had to
do. Besides, I would state that some few Years
ago a Misunderstanding took place between the
Overseers at Bridgwater and the Medical Men
who had the Care of the Parish, and who at that
Time were paid Eighty Guineas a Year, which
they found to be insufficient, and required 100l.
The Overseers demurred at giving this Sum; and
whilst the Dispute was settling I was desired to
allow my Assistant to take the Charge of the
Poor, which he did for Three Months, keeping
an Account during that Time; and though many
Things were omitted to be put down during the
Three Months, and the Charges were One Third
less than the usual established Charges of the
Country, Half a Guinea for every Case of
Midwifery, and a Guinea for every Fracture, the
Account for those Three Months amounted to
upwards of 381. for the Parish of Bridgwater
alone.

*Do you mean to say, upon your credit as a
professional Man, that the Salaries offered by the
Board of Guardians in the first instance to the
Medical Men were such as would not leave to them
any thing like a Remuneration for their Trouble after
paying the Expense of their Horse Hire and their
Medicines?*

I believe they generally lost; I sincerely
believe they did. I know that my Son, if he had
not had the Assistance of my Horses and my
other Son, who is in Practice with me, would
have lost considerably by it; and I believe the
others did the same.

The Object of your Pamphlet was to endeavour to

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

8

show that they were justifi ed in refusing that Remuneration which had been offered to them, and were not answerable for the Consequences which had arisen from that Refusal?

Yes. I would beg to state that all those Circumstances produced a great Sensation, a great deal of bad Feeling towards the Medical Men, very great Misrepresentation; and therefore it was thought proper that we should state the Facts of the Case to the Public, in order that we might set ourselves right in the public Opinion.

If there was a bad Feeling towards the Medical Men, was not there on the other hand a bad Feeling towards the Board of Guardians?

I believe not; as far as I was individually concerned I assisted in every Way I could to establish the Law, and to assist the Board of Guardians as far as I could.

There has been a Stranger introduced into Bridgwater who has charge of that District?

Yes.

That is one of the Grievances of which you, the Medical Men, have complained? I think the Mode of his Introduction was a Grievance. I think I may fairly state that he obtained his Appointment by the Assumption of fictitious Titles. I believe I am in a Condition to prove that.

Did you take some pains to ascertain this?

Yes. It was very desirable that we should know who the Person was who came under these Circumstances. When we passed those previous Resolutions we believed that no Gentleman of Character or Respectability would accept the Terms the Board of Guardians offered.

763 *Is it your Opinion that if a proper Offer had been made by the Board of Guardians they would have obtained in the Parishes a proper Person for the Appointment?*

Yes; but I believe this Stranger brought no Introduction whatever.

Do you know whether he brought any Testimonials?

No; but Persons who come into a new Neighbourhood usually bring an Introduction to a Banker or some other Person.

The Board of Guardians having advertised for Medical Persons, if Medical Persons come with proper Testimonials, they are bound to receive them without Introduction, are they not?

I believe I can prove that some of those Testimonials were not correct.

There could be no Occasion for an Introduction, as the Guardians had advertised for Persons to come and tender themselves as Candidates for the Appointment?

Strictly speaking, there was not; but it is usual to bring Introductions.

It is to be supposed that upon having seen his Testimonials, if they were satisfactory, they would appoint him?

I sincerely believe their Feeling was so strong against the Medical Men they would have appointed anybody.

You state that you conceive no respectable Man would come upon those Terms; do you extend that Observation to Mr. Moseley?

I know nothing of Mr. Moseley but that when he was informed of the Facts he left the Town.

Do you know that he left the Town because he found that he must under take the Duties of the Office immediately?

No, I do not; I know only as I have been told by many of the Guardians; I believe as soon as Mr. Moseley understood the Circumstances under which he was elected he resigned.

Do you know whether the Circumstances which occasioned his Resignation were not that he was required immediately to enter upon the Performance of his Duties?

I do not.

You do not know that that was not so?

No; I only state that which I have heard, that as soon as he was acquainted with the Circumstances of the Case under which he was elected he resigned. I believe he was very glad to escape.

Is it usual, when a Surgeon's Recommendation is for practising in a different Place, or for being appointed for an Office, and he is represented to be a Surgeon in a particular Town, - is it usual to inquire whether he has ever resided within that Town?

I believe so; that is the Course I have always pursued.

If they had inquired, with respect to the Gentleman elected at Bridgwater, whether he had resided and practised in Newcastle for a long Time, would th have found it true?

No. They might have availed themselves of the Means which I did; I inquired and found it was not true; and I made subsequent Inquiries.

Of course the Board of Guardians could have made the same Inquiries as you did?

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

9

Yes. I had the pleasure of being acquainted with Dr. Smith at Newcastle, and I wrote to him, and obtained his Answer : " Newcastle, 21st July 1837. Dear Sir, I have delayed answering your Letter in the Hope of obtaining some Information respecting J. R. Ward. I have inquired of many Medical Men, who had not heard of him; and I can only tell you that at No. 60, Pilgrim Street, there is a very bright Green Door with a very large Brass Plate, which I hear has been there about Six Weeks. A Medical Friend informs me that a very flashy Man, with a Profusion of Breast Pins, Rings, Gold Chains, & c., called on him some Weeks ago, saying his Name was Ward; that he was come to reside in Newcastle; and, by the Advice of 764 and, by the Advice of his Friend, Dr. Blundell, he intended to give Lectures to Female Practitioners in Midwifery, and wished to know what my Friend, who has been a Teacher for some Years, was in the habit of charging. From the Report given me of this Interview, Mr. John Rodney Ward is exactly the Sort of Person, in Dress and Address, that you would expect after reading the Card you sent me. Should I hear any thing respecting this Person worth communicating I will write to you again. "

Is that Dr. Blundell of London who is referred to?

Yes. He is not at home, or I should have ascertained the Fact from him; he is in Paris. In the course of my Inquiries I have elicited other Facts. Mr. Ward, in his Card, states that he is a Graduate in the University of Leyden : a Friend has written to Leyden, but has not got an Answer; but I understand that Degrees are to be purchased there, and that it is a common Practice. " A Member of the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries; " he is a Licentiate of that Body. The next is, " late Consulting Surgeon Accoucheur to the Royal Maternity Society, Doctors Commons. " Of my own Knowledge, I know the Difficulty there is in obtaining an Appointment to Metropolitan Charities; and I have applied to Dr. Ramsbotham, who has given me this Answer : " My dear Sir, Mr. J. R. Ward was for, I think, about Two Years one of the Assistant Surgeons to the Royal Maternity Charity for the Borough District. There are Fifteen Surgeon Apothecaries, living in different Parts of London, attached to this Institution, and they are designated in the printed Forms 'Assistant Surgeons,' (as being Assistants to the Physicians,) although there is no Appointment either of Surgeon or Consulting Surgeon. " The next is, " Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary for Diseases of Children. " Mr. Dendy, the Surgeon to that Institution, states, " My dear Sir, In answer to your Letters regarding a Gentle man of the Name of John Rodney Ward who has announced himself as Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary for the Diseases of Children, I can have no Hesitation in assuring you that I have no Recollection of such a Person being attached to the Infirmary in Waterloo Road, to which I am the senior Surgeon. This was established in 1816, and I

have been attached to it almost during the whole of this Period. The oldest annual Report which is just at hand is that of 1826 : in that and subsequent Reports there is no such Name among the Officers. My own Mind is convinced that no Person of the Name of Ward has ever been a Surgeon of the Establishment, which would be proved by any Reference to the Records. Our Infirmary is the oldest Establishment of the Kind in London. Some Years since another was founded near Golden Square, The Royal Metropolitan Infirmary. These, you may be assured, are the only Two which are entitled to the Epithet - Royal. A Mr. Ward may have seen Patients at his House, and called that a Royal Infirmary; this of course is Usurpation, and very great Presumption, to say the least. I believe I have written all that can be required to afford a decided Negative to your Question. I remain, dear Sir, yours very faithfully, Walter C. Dandy. " He then states himself to be Consulting Surgeon Accoucheur to the Southwark Childbed Society, Guy's Hospital. In order to ascertain the fact I called on Doctor Ashwell, who is the obstetric Physician and Lecturer at Guy's Hospital, who writes me, " My dear Sir, I have no Hesitation in replying distinctly to the Question you put to me as to Mr. John R. Ward. He is not in any way attached to the obstetric Department of Guy's Hospital or School. " I think I ought, in justice to the Medical Gentlemen of Bridgwater, to state that there is an Action at this Time pending against Mr. Ward for Malpractice, which will be tried the next Assizes.

By whom is it brought?

By a Woman of the Name of Webber of Taunton.

What Sort of Accident?

Dislocation of the Shoulder.

Has the Action been brought by the Woman herself, or by your Society?

By the Woman. The Woman lives at Taunton; I never saw her in my Life.

765 *Are there no Individuals of your Society who, in point of fact, instituted that Action?*

Not at all, as I have been informed by the Surgeon to whom the Woman applied at a later Period to know whether the Shoulder had been reduced.

It is an Action against him for Want of Skill?

Yes; for not having understood the Case, and not reduced the dislocated Shoulder.

In what Condition was the Woman?

She is, I believe, a poor Woman; she has a Son, a Labourer at Bridgwater.

Has she brought an Action at her own Risk?

I do not know how that may be; I only know

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

10

that I have had noth do with it, nor do I believe that any Medical Man at Bridgwater has any thing to do with it.

Was it at Taunton Mr. Ward attended her?

No; at Bridgwater.

Did he attend her as Parochial Surgeon?

No; I believe as a private Patient. I have heard that the Woman became chargeable either to the Taunton or the Wellington Union, to which she belonged, and in consequence of that some Proceedings were taken.

Of what Sort?

That the Woman applied to a professional Man.

That it was in consequence of her applying for Relief some Steps at Law were taken?

I understood so. This I know, that her professional Man is Mr. Trenchard of Taunton, who is a highly respectable Man. The Statements I have read are confirmed by the Secretary of the British Medical Association at Exeter Hall. And there are some other Points connected with it which I think will justify the Medical Men of Bridgwater not holding Communication with Mr. Ward : It is said that he was sent to the Queen's Bench Prison the 24th of January 1829, and went before the Insolvent Debtors Court on his Petition 15th of April 1829, and was remanded for Nine Calendar Months within the Walls, under the Forty - ninth Section of the Act, at the Suit of John Thomas, but he settled with the plaintiff, and was discharged in consequence the 7th of July following. I copied this from the Books of the Insolvent Debtors Court.

Do you think it improper for a Medical Man to associate with any Gentleman that has taken advantage of the Insolvent Debtors Court?

No; but I think our subsequent Inquiries have justified us in the Course we have taken.

Did you learn why he was remanded in the Insolvent Debtors Court; what was the Action?

An Action for Slander.

What were the Damages?

191l. I have a Copy which I took from the Books of the Court : " 15th April 1829. Discharged, after Nine Calendar Months Custody within the Walls of the Prison, at the Suit of John Thomas, late of Earl Street, Lisson Grove, Paddington, Middlesex, being indebted to him in the Sum of 1911. for Damages recovered in an Action for Slander. " Amount of Property belonging to himself, Wife, and Child, 14l. 9s. 6d. I hold also in my Hand a Proof that Mr. Ward is not a Member of the College of Surgeons.

Does he state that he is so on his Card?

He states that he is a Graduate in Medicine and Surgery of the University of Leyden.

That is not contradictory to the Assertion on his Card?

No; but Mr. Upton, the Solicitor for the Apothecaries Company, clearly states the same Resolution, that the Medical Officers of Unions should be both : " Mr. Ridout has placed in my Hands, as the Law Officer of the Society, your Letter to him of the 23d Instant. A Difference of Opinion exists between the Society and the Poor Law Commissioners on the Subject of the Qualification of the Medical Officers appointed to 766 Unions under the Poor Law Amendment Act, the Society contending that the Medical Officer should be both a Member of the College of Surgeons and a Licentiate of their Body, and the Commissioners holding that either Qualification is sufficient, "

Have you made any Observation on the Entries in the Books?

I have seen the Books sometimes, and have seen some Entries in them.

Have you any Observations to make on them?

I do not think the Entries are correct, in many Instances. There is One I should be very glad to have examined : I was asked Yesterday whether I could produce any Proofs of Hostility or Calumny towards the Medical Men; I think I can, on referring to the Books when the Appointment of Surgeons took place, about Three Weeks since. I think last Friday Three Weeks the late Chairman, Mr. Warry, took Occasion to draw a Comparison between the Skill of the Medical Men of Bridgwater and Mr. Ward.

How do you know this?

I had it from the Guardians.

From whom?

From Mr. Watson, and it has not been denied by Mr. Warry; he has been written to, and has not denied it.

Have you asked him that?

My Son has written to him, and he has not denied it. I have an Affidavit proving the Fact stated by the Chairman is untrue; the Chairman has not only not denied it, but he has admitted it.

Have you his Letter?

I have not it here; it is at Bridgwater.

The Affidavit is read, and is as follows : William Sprouting of Bridgwater in the County of Somerset, Labourer, maketh Oath, and saith : That in or about the Month of January 1835 he felt a Pain in his Side,

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

11

accompanied with Cough, and that Mr. Thomas Symes gave him a Recommendation as an Out - Patient of the Bridgwater Infirmary : That Deponent was admitted an Out Patient thereof, and was attended by Mr. John Toogood, one of the Surgeons of the said Infirmary : That Deponent continued an Out - Patient of the Infirmary about a Month, when he got better, and was discharged from the Infirmary, and went to his Work of a Plasterer : That he continued pretty well about a Year, being able to attend to his Work, but he felt occasional Pain in his Side, especially when he had a Cold and Cough. About a Year after his Discharge from the Infirmary the Pain in his Side increased, and he was obliged to be in Bed; Deponent then sent for Mr. John Evered Poole as Parish Surgeon, Mr. Poole being then acting for Mr. King, the Parish Surgeon, who was ill. Deponent continued under the Care of Mr. King and Mr. Poole during the whole Time they continued Parish Surgeons, and up to the Time when Mr. Ward was appointed Parish Surgeon, namely, to Mid summer 1837, or thereabouts. During the Time Deponent was under the Care of Mr. Poole and Mr. King a Swelling took place in his Side, which afterwards burst, and the Wounds were attended to by Mr. King and Mr. Poole. Bread - and - Water Poultices were ordered by Mr. King, who opened the Abscess in Deponent's Side. During this period Deponent received Pay from the Parish, but continued to work at his Trade as well as he was able. After Mr. Ward was appointed Parish Surgeon Deponent applied to him, and Mr. Ward ordered a Linseed Poultice with Beer Grounds to be applied to the Wound, but Deponent's Wife was afraid to apply it, thinking it was too strong, and the Bread - and - Water Poultice was still continued. Two or Three Months afterwards Deponent observed something, which he believes was a piece of Bone, sticking out of the Wound which had been lanced by Mr. King. Deponent then went to Mr. Ward and showed him his Side, - a Person was with Mr. Ward, when Mr. Ward then pulled the Piece of Bone out of Deponent's Side. Deponent went afterwards to Mr. Ward about twice a week for a Fortnight or Three Weeks, during which his Side was dressed as ordered by Mr. Ward. All the Wounds, except where the Bone came out, healed of their own Accord, and that Place is now open, and has been constantly running since, but does not prevent Deponent from going to his work. At Mr. Ward's Request Deponent wrote down upon Paper the Particulars of his Illness, the Names of the Surgeons who had attended him, and the Treatment he had undergone, to which Deponent signed his Name, and gave it to Mr. Ward. Deponent's Pay was soon afterwards stopped, and Deponent has not had any Pay since, except for about a Fortnight or Three Weeks during the severe Weather last Winter. Deponent has not been attended by Mr. Ward since about Five or Six Weeks after the Bone was taken out of his Side, but the Wound from whence the Bone came out is not yet healed, W. M. SPROUTING.

767 This was brought forward as a distinct Charge against one of the Officers of the

Bridgwater Infirmary.

How do you know that?

I know it from many of the Guardians. Mr. Watson will prove every Word of it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Witness is again called in.

What are the Matters you complain of in the Conduct of the Board of Guardians towards the Medical Men?

We complain of their making Charges against us privately, without giving us any Opportunity of meeting them, and defending ourselves.

When you say privately you mean in the Board?

Yes; and I can state that the Facts brought forward are not true with regard to the Case of Sprouting, that he was discharged from the Infirmary cured.

#HERE SATURDAY MORNING

Whom do you propose to be called to prove that such Statements were made in the Board of Guardians?

Mr. Thomas Howell Watson will prove that Mr. Warry stated what he did.

What do you understand those Charges to have been?

The Charge made was, that a Man of the Name of William Sprouting had been discharged incurable from the Bridgwater Infirmary, and had been subsequently speedily cured by Mr. Ward. I can speak to the Facts from my own Knowledge : the Facts of the Case are, that Sprouting was admitted the 25th of January 1835; he was discharged the 1st of March 1835. He did not get under Mr. Ward's Care till 1837, having been, during the Interval, Two Years or a Year and a Half, under the Care of Mr. Poole and Mr. King; and the Man is not well now; he is just in the same State in which he was; therefore if he is entered in the Book cured it is a false Entry, as I am satisfied many others were.

What is his Malady?

He has a scrofulous Abscess. I saw the Man last Friday Week myself, and examined him.

Had he that when he was admitted into the Infirmary?

No; a different Complaint altogether : he was admitted for a Pain in his Side. He was discharged cured on the 1st of March, and Four or Six Months afterwards he became ill again, and then applied to the Parish Surgeon, and was under his Care from June or July 1835 to June

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

12

1837.

When he applied to the Parish Surgeon was it for the same Complaint?

No; a Swelling and Abscess in front of the Abdomen. It is open now, and discharges.

Not at all where he complained of Pain?

No; but it is very possible that as scrofulous Diseases begin in a very insidious Way the Pain he first complained of may have ultimately become the Disease it now is : it took more than a Year before the Abscess formed.

Is the Disease which he had last June that which is stated to be now cured?

No; nor is it the Disease he was subject to when in the Infirmary.

You say he was discharged as cured?

Yes; and went to Work for Three or Four Months.

With that scrofulous Disease?

He had no Swelling or Sore at the Time, only a Pain in his Side; he had no Symptoms of scrofulous Disease.

What did you suppose it to arise from?

From common Cold or Lumbago.

768.

When was he treated by Mr. King or Mr. Poole?

I think about July 1835.

That was before the Formation of the Union?

Yes; the Man continues in the same State in which he was from the Time he applied to the Parish Surgeon, and is not cured.

From the Terms of this Affidavit it would appear that he was never without occasional Pain in his Side, that it increased considerably, and he was obliged to lie in Bed?

The Books of the Infirmary will show that he was discharged cured on the 1st of March, and has never been a Patient there since.

You mean to say that Mr. Warry charged that Mr. Ward had cured this Man, and that he had not been cured by other Medical Men?

Yes; and if Mr. Ward states that that Man is cured that is not the Fact.

You state that you believe that Entry is false, and that many others are also?

Yes, I believe that is the Fact; and that can be proved by others. Who are the Persons to whom you would refer? As to the Declarations in the Board, Mr. Thomas Howell Watson.

What other Witness would you wish to be summoned to prove the Facts of Sprouting's Case?

There are no other Persons but Mr. King and Mr. Evered Poole who know the Facts of Sprouting's Case. Mr. King is perfectly acquainted with the Facts. I was Yesterday asked for the Date of the Letter calling the Association; the Date of the Letter was the 5th of June.

Have you got that Letter?

No; I take it from a Newspaper, in which there are some Observations made about it. That was the Day on which Mr. Young states that he received his Letter. There is one Point I wish to suggest, on which great Stress seems to be laid in Mr. Weale's Report, which seems to be made a Charge as to the Orders having been directed to be sparingly given. I think I have the Means of proving that such was the Fact. I can prove this by Documents. I have Copies of the, which were furnished me by Mr. Abraham King, that the Three Weeks before the Expiration of the Contract the Number of Patients amounted to 167; the Three Weeks during which they were treated as ordinary Patients they were 110, and the Three Weeks afterwards they were 171; but there is Evidence, also, in Mr. Caswell's Papers of the same Fact. Here is a very important Letter to Mr. Caswell from Mr. Easton, one of the Overseers of Pawlett, a highly respectable Man : " Dear Sir, I beg the Favour of you to attend Joseph White, who certainly is an Object of Charity, and in Distress; and also Simon Williams. I feel a Reluctance in making such Applications, supposing you are not amply paid for your Services; at the same Time it grieves me to witness a poor Fellowcreature perishing for Want of Medical Assistance, which we have been heretofore enabled to procure. Any Necessaries which these Persons may be in want of, please to state, and I will immediately send them. " It is dated Pawlett, the 23d of June 1837.

You have been in possession of Mr. Caswell's Papers; have you been in possession of his Medical Returns?

No.

What was the Period that the Medical Officers attended the Paupers as independent Patients?

From the 25th of June.

You are not aware of the Number of Patients in Mr. Caswell's Books; that the Number found in his Book in the Week ending the 1st of June is 18 Patients, the Week ending the 8th of June 23 Patients, the Week ending the 15th of June 32 Patients, the Week ending the 22d of June 43 Patients, the Week ending the 30th of June 53 Patients,

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

13

*the Week ending the 7th of July 41 Patients,
the Week ending the 20th of July 43 Patients,
the Week ending the 24th of August 24 Patients,
the 31st of August 32 Patients,
and the 8th of September 24 Patients?*

No. I have the Orders he received to attend
the Paupers; these were given me by Mrs.
Caswell last Week.

769

*How many does it appear from this Paper he
attended?*

I really do not know.

*You are not aware that the Figures given you by
the Question are taken from his weekly Book, signed
with his own Name?*

No; I know nothing of those. I was asked
whether I could give any other Names when I
stated that I thought the Books would be found
incorrect. I believe, if your Lordships inquire,
the Name of a Patient appears three Times in
One Week.

Do you mean Mr. Ward's Books?

No; I do not know the Surgeon, but I know it
is in the District of the Relieving Officer, John
Chinn; he himself told me there was an Entry
made in one of the Surgeon's Books of Visits
Three Times in One Week to a Man who had
been dead and buried a Fortnight before. It is
the Polden Hill District; he has the Charge of the
Middlezoy District.

Do you know when this was?

Yes; last Year, as I understood.

Who had that District last Year?

Mr. Young; he was one of those appointed
the last Year.

He was not one of the Surgeons before?

No.

*He was appointed after the other Surgeons
declined to accept the Terms?*

Yes. In the next Union adjoining this one of
the Medical Men was dismissed for altering the
Dates, and making false Entries in the Books,
and I cautioned our Medical Men to be very
careful in keeping the Books; and one said " " " " " "
I assure you I do not believe that they are careful at all
about their Books. " There are Three Visits to One
Man who had been dead Three Weeks, and I
asked Mr. Chinn, in the Presence of the Coroner,
when he was there, whether that was the Fact,

and he said it was.

*Do you think it would be useful to have the
Coroner always attend on the Deaths of Persons in
the Workhouse?*

I think it would be useful. I do not think that
some of them come by their Deaths fairly.

*What do you mean by their not coming by their
Deaths fairly?*

I cannot think that Sixteen should die in a
Fortnight by Inflammation of the Lungs, which I
understood was on the Books shown me, while
only One Death from Inflammation of the Lungs
occurred out of Seven thousand out of the
House.

*Does Diarrhoea sometimes terminate in
Inflammation of the Lungs?*

I have never seen such an Instance.

*How many do you say died of Inflammation of the
Lungs?*

I think they mentioned Eight.

In how long a Time?

I think Two Months.

*How many were there in the Workhouse at that
Time?*

I do not know; I know nothing of the
Workhouse but from others.

*Do you know how many died in the Union in
those Two Months that Sixteen died in the
Workhouse?*

No, I do not. I believe One only died in the
whole of the Bridgwater District of
Inflammation of the Lungs.

*You do not know when it was that the Names
were repeated Three Times in Mr. Young's Books?*

No; I heard it from Mr. Tilsley. It was
repeated by Mr. Chinn in the Presence of the
Coroner, Mr. Caines.

Is Diarrhea in a very late Stage of it infectious?

Yes; I should think it was.

770.

*It would not be proper to have new Patients
brought in from the Country along with such
Persons?*

No.

*You would consider that at the Time when so
many Persons died in the Workhouse there was an
infectious Disorder?*

Yes.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

14

At the Time the Diarrhæa was prevailing in the Workhouse who was the Doctor of the Workhouse?

I believe Mr. King. I believe it prevailed afterwards, during Mr. Ward's Time as well.

The Time it raged so greatly in the Workhouse was in January and February 1837, was not it?

I believe it was; but I took no Part in this Matter until my Advice was solicited by the junior Branches of the Profession.

Would you have thought it improper to send in fresh Paupers while the Disorder was raging?

Certainly.

Do you know whether fresh Paupers were sent in at that Time?

I have read such an Account.

Do you know whether the Medical Officer remonstrated against it?

I have heard that he did.

You have said that in all Cases of Presentation of the Placenta you have invariably endeavoured to get Assistance?

Yes, I have.

Is that for the sake of Consultation and Satisfaction, or for mechanical Aid?

Not for mechanical Aid.

Merely for the sake of Consultation?'

Yes; and for the Comfort and Protection of the Surgeon in attendance. I conceive only One Person can do it. There may be such Cases indeed occur; it may become a Question of Time when the Operation of Delivery shall be performed, and on that Point I think a Consultation would be always desirable. If it is done too early great Mischief will ensue. I have known a Case where it was too soon, and the Child escaped from the Vagina into the Cavity of the Belly, and was taken out alive, and the Woman is living now.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JAMES FRANKLIN WAITES is called in, and examined as follows :

YOU are Relieving Officer of the Fourth District of the Bridgwater Union?

Yes.

Do you remember a Woman of the Name of Charlotte Allen applying for Medical Relief?

Yes.

Under what Circumstances did she apply to you for Medical Relief?

She applied for Medical Relief from Illness.
When?

In the early Part of June 1837.

Did you give her an Order?

Yes, I did.

Upon whom?.

Upon Mr. Ruddock.

He was in charge of the District?

Yes.

771

Do you know how long he continued to attend her?

I cannot say as to the Date.

Had you any Conversation with him with respect to her Lying - in?

Some little Time after that I had occasion to call to speak to him about some poor Persons, and we had some Conversation.

What was that Conversation?

When I was in his Surgery he asked me who was going to attend her in her Confinement; I said at first, " I do not know, Sir, but I suppose you, as the Woman has been ill some Time. " He then asked me whether she had been an unhealthy Woman; I said, she had been. It appeared that he did not know she had been an unhealthy Woman before, for he attended her a very short Time; and I believe previous to this Conversation between him and me he had left off attending her some little Time, However he asked me if I would give him an Order to attend her in her Confinement; I said I could not give him an Order without applying to the Board, as there was sufficient Time to apply; he asked me whether I would apply for that Order, which I did do the following Board Day.

Did you recommend to the Board to give that Order?

Yes, I applied to the Board in the regular Way, as I do in other Cases. #

Did you state to the Board that the Woman had been in bad Health?

Yes.

And that you thought it a Case that a Surgeon should attend?

My Application was for a Midwife and Nurse in her Confinement. An Observation was made in the Board, that they thought she could do with a Woman Midwife; it was observed that she could do as well as other Women. I made the Observation that she had been an unhealthy Woman, and a Woman that was very much

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

15

affected in her Manner : I thought it would be better that a Medical Man should be sent for, What I meant was, that she makes a good deal of fuss about trifling Things. A Gentleman, since dead, made an Observa tion, that many Women had been attended by Females.

Who was that Gentleman?

Mr. Poole. He said his Mother had been attended by a Woman, and that a Woman assisted him into the World, and that he had no Doubt this Woman would do as well as others, I said, perhaps if a Doctor was not allowed she might make more fuss than other Persons; he said he had no Doubt she would do well, but if she needed it a Doctor might be had at the Time.

The Result of your Application to the Board of Guardians was that they declined sending a Medical Man to her, but she was to be delivered by a Midwife?

Yes; if a Medical Man was wanted I was to provide him.

What was the next Thing you heard of this Woman?

The next Thing I heard of her was her Confinement.

Did you communicate to her that she was not to have a Medical Man?

No, I did not do that; but she was acquainted with it.

What Communication had you previously with Mr. Ruddock? Did he say he thought it was a Case in which a Medical Man ought to be employed?

Mr. Ruddock did not know any thing about it. I stated to him the State in which she was; he asked me whether she had been an unhealthy Woman.

He had been attending her?

For a very short Time; only a few Days, I believe.

Did he state to you that her Labour was likely to be of that Nature that it was likely to require the Assistance of a Medical Man and not a Midwife?

No such Words passed.

When you applied to the Board you thought it was better that a Medical Man should attend her?

Yes; and I mentioned it to the Board.

Did not Mr. Ruddock state to you that a Medical Man ought to attend her?

He did not; no such Words passed previous to the Application being made to the Board.

She was confined on the 30th of June?

Yes.

Was an Application made to you very soon after that for any thing on her Account?

The following Morning.

What was that Application?

The Nurse applied to me; she came to my House to say that she was delivered, and I sent her back with the Groats.

Did you ask her any thing respecting the Circumstances of the Case?

No, I do not recollect that.

What did she say?

She said she was doing as well as could be expected; that she was doing well.

What is the Name of the Nurse?

Mary Date.

Is she the Sister of Kitty Walker?

Yes; she was living in the House with her.

On the following Monday Morning you went to relieve the Poor at Stowey, did you not?

Yes.

Did Elizabeth Woolley meet you there?

She attended for Charlotte Allen, and took her Relief.

Did any thing pass at that Time respecting a Doctor?

Yes, I was waiting in the Churchyard till the Bread came, and while I was waiting this Woman said, " Mr. Waites, I suppose as Charlotte Allen was not attended by a Doctor she cannot have a Doctor now. " I asked her why? She said that she complained of not being well. I asked, what was the Matter? She said that she was different from what she had been in any of her Confine ments. I said, " Certainly, if a Doctor is wanted she must have him though it was a Woman who put her to Bed " I asked a Question or Two, but I thought it was likely to be rather indelicate for me to ask Questions. She said she should like for my Wife to go and see her; I desired her to call upon my Wife as she went home, which she did, and my Wife agreed to go and see her in the course of that Day.

772

The Suggestion of the Medical Man was entirely your own?

Yes; Mr. Ruddock asked who was to attend her, and I said, " I suppose you. "

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

16

That was in consequence of your not liking to ask the Questions which were necessary?

Yes.

Your Wife has had a good many Children, has she not?

She has had Ten; the Mother of the Midwife that attended this Woman attended my Wife with Six or Seven.

Did you say any thing to Woolley about your not being able to send anybody without some particular Case, or any thing of that Sort?

The first Words I said were, " If the Doctor is wanted he should be had. "

Did you say you had been cautioned?

I have no Recollection of such a Conversation passing.

Had you been cautioned?

No, I had not.

773

Had you not been told to be cautious?

The only Caution I had was at the Time of the Conversation with the Medical Officers of the Board, that we were to be careful in giving Orders, but to attend and give them when they were wanted.

Who gave you that Direction?

Several of the Guardians.

Was that delivered to you from the Chair?

Yes, the Chairman and Mr. Poole.

Was this Direction delivered to you by the Chairman as from the Board in general?

Yes, it was.

Mr. Poole is now dead?

Yes.

Did your Wife go down in consequence of this?

She did not go immediately.

How came she not to go immediately?

The Midwife came to our House before she went.

What Interval elapsed between the Conversation in the Churchyard and your Wife going?

Perhaps a Couple of Hours or thereabouts.

She went at the End of Two Hours?

No; I think not quite so soon as that; the Midwife came and said she had been to see her, and that she thought that a little opening

Medicine would be very useful; and that she did not see there was any Necessity for a Doctor, but she thought a Dose of Castor Oil might be useful.

Were you present?

No; I was told that by my Wife. I came in, in fact, before the Midwife left.

Was the Castor Oil obtained for her?

Yes; I sent and bought it, and sent it to her.

Did she say that Charlotte Allen complained of being weak and in Pain at Times?

Yes, I believe she did.

Did you hear her say any thing of that Sort?

Not then.

Did you hear her say that she fancied something must be wrong?

No; that did not pass to me; it passed between the Midwife and my Wife.

Did your Wife then go down with the Midwife?

I cannot say that she did.

What was the Conversation which passed between the Midwife and your Wife?

I cannot explain that perfectly; they are both in attendance.

When was it that your Wife went down to Charlotte Allen's House?

I believe it was on the Wednesday.

How came she to go on the Wednesday?

Because the Midwife came and said she was worse and she wished her to go. I heard this Conversation : that Charlotte Allen thought something was wrong, and she wanted her to go to convince her that nothing was wrong. My Wife went and made some Inquiries, and found that nothing appeared to be wrong from her Notion of the Thing; but as Charlotte Allen wished a Medical Man to be sent to her they came back to me, and I gave the Order to the Midwife, thinking she was the proper Person to go to him in case he should wish to ask her any Questions.

774

How long was this after the first Application?

This was Wednesday Evening; it was on the Monday Morning that I saw Elizabeth Woolley.

It was not an Application from Charlotte Allen?

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

17

No.
*Who was Mrs. Woolley? What had she to do with
Charlotte Allen?*

She was a Neighbour, and lived close by.
*In consequence of your Order he did attend on
Charlotte Allen?*

Yes.
Did she continue long ill?
Yes, a long while.

Could she get up out of her Bed?
She was out of Bed the next Day after her
Confinement; the Midwife found her out of Bed
the next Day after her Confinement.

How long did she continue in that Parish?
From the 30th of June till about Two Months
or Ten Weeks ago.

Was she very ill all that Time?
She was very ill for some Time.

Did you visit her?

Yes.
Was she offensive?

I never found any thing of the Sort.
On no Occasion?

No.
Did she complain to you of any particular Thing?
No, only of being weak.

*Did Mr. Ruddock ever tell you what was the
Matter with her?*

No.
*Did she lie in her Bed the greater Part of her
Time?*

She was in Bed the greater Part of the Time. I
have no Doubt she might have got out of Bed
before she did, from Reports I heard in the Place.

What makes you think so?
Because she is rather sly. She was seen at
Work on some Occasions, and then when People
came in she was seen in Bed.

Have you ever seen her at Work?
No.

Who had seen her?
The Nurse.

Is she here?
No.
What is her Name?

Mary Date.
You have heard her say so?

Yes.
*When you called upon her you always found her
in Bed?*

Yes.
*Did she know when you were going to call upon
her?*

No, not at all.
What became of her?

The Board allowed her 2s, 6d. to go with her
Friends from Stowey, Five or Six Miles off.

775

She was relieved considerably more than that
during her Confinement at Stowey; sometimes
5s. or 6s. a Week, sometimes rather more,
sometimes not quite so much, from her
Confinement up to the Time she left Stowey,
which was about Ten Weeks ago.

Did she apply for Money to go to her Friends?

The Board wished her to be removed, on
account of her having a Bastard Child, to the
Workhouse at Bridgwater. She complained of
being unable to go; that Mr. Ruddock had
reported her unfit. At last she had a Wish to go
with her Friends, and the Board took it into
consideration, and allowed her 2s. 6d. a Week to
go with them. She got better from being out of
the District. The Entry on the Minutes of the
Board is, that they were not able to allow her
any Relief in another Union, and the Pay was
stopped; and she returned and went into the
Bridgwater Workhouse, where she is now.

*She did not go to the Board simply for the Purpose
of avoiding going into the Workhouse, but applied for
Leave to go?*

Yes; she said if she was allowed something
she would go to her Friends; she had been in
Bed Six Months before. That Day that she left
she got up at Six in the Morning and walked
from her House to the Cart, and went over the
Mendip Hills.

Did you see her yourself?

I saw her, and visited her Two or Three
Times after she went there; she had been
confined to her Bed there Five or Six Months
before she left Stowey.

*What Distance had she to walk to the Cart?
Twenty or Thirty Yards?*

Twenty Yards, perhaps, from the Room

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

18

where she slept.

What Sort of Roads have they there?

Not very good; they are hilly.

*Did she go by her own Choice, or was she sent by
the Guardians?*

She had hired the Cart herself.

What did she pay for it?

I cannot say.

*What was the first Time you saw her after she was
delivered?*

I did not see her for some Time.

*Did your Wife report to you that she complained
of not having a Medical Man to attend her?*

No.

*When did you hear the first Complaint of that
Sort?*

I never heard of any Complaint on that
Subject till I heard of the Pamphlet being out.

*Did Mr. Ruddock ever complain to you of
allowing her to go on too long without a Medical
Man?*

No.

You frequently saw Mr. Ruddock?

Yes.

Did you ever converse with him on the Subject?

I never said but little to him; I always fancy
that he is very close in his Conversation, and
does not choose to answer my Questions;
sometimes when I asked him about Persons
Complaints.

He refuses to answer you?

He does not do it. I do not know what his
Reason his.

He is not communicative with you?

No.

*Is it not desirable you should communicate with
the Doctor?*

Yes; but he is a Man who has very little to
say; he answers me very shortly

Will you state that positively?

I will positively state that before I ever made
the Application no such Words passed, and I do
not remember such a Conversation passing
afterwards.

You are sure nothing of the Kind passed before?

I am quite certain.

*You are not quite sure that after the Application
was made by yourself he did not tell you he ought to
have been employed before?*

It has been reported that he did before, I have
no Recollection on the Subject.

*You have no Recollection that he told you he
ought to have been employed before?*

I have no Recollection of the Kind.

*When you went to the Board of Guardians before
she was confined did you state the Conversation that
had passed between you and Mr. Ruddock?*

I did not.

*You stated that Mr. Ruddock asked you who
would attend her, and you answered him you
supposed he would?*

Yes; that is, that I expected that the Board
would allow it as soon as I mentioned it; that I
expected it to be done.

And you recommended it?

I did.

*You thought it a Case in which a Medical Man
should attend?*

The only Reason for my supposing it was a
Case in which a Medical Man should attend was
that I had known her well, and that she had had
a deal of Sickness; but a Gentleman who was
there, who knew her well, and who knew the
Circumstances, said he thought she might do
with a Woman as other very respectable Women
did; but if she did want a Medical Man she
should have one.

Is she a well - grown Woman and tall?

Tolerably.

A stout Woman?

Not particularly stout.

What Age?

About Thirty.

Able - bodied?

*She is not able - bodied at present; but I
understand that she is not worse than she has been
for several Years.*

She is not deformed?

No.

776

*Is he the Medical Officer of the same District
now?*

Yes.

*Did he not tell you it was absolutely necessary she
should have a Medical Man?*

I have no Recollection of the Kind.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

19

*You say she is as well now as she has been for
several Years?*

Yes; that is the Report

*Have you seen her since she came home across the
Hills?*

Yes; I have seen her nursing her Child.

Did she appear pretty well?

I have seen her Three Times since she left
Stowey to go over the Hills, and each Time I
found her looking better than she had done
before.

When did you see her last?

I saw her about a Fortnight back in the
Workhouse.

777

Did she look well?

Yes, pretty well.

Was she offensive?

I never found her so; I have been at her Bed -
side several Times.

Did you stay long?

A Quarter of an Hour.

Did your Wife visit her?

Yes.

*Did she ever state to you that she found her
offensive?*

No.

*Do you mean to say it was only from your own
Impression that you proposed that the Medical Man
should attend her in her Confinement, and not from
the Recommendation of Mr. Ruddock?*

I made the Application on the Advice of Mr.
Ruddock.

Had not he told you it was necessary?

No.

In what Terms did he make the Suggestion?

I had occasion to go to speak to him about
several poor Persons; he asked me, " Who is to
attend Charlotte Allen in her Confinement? " I said " I
suppose you, Sir, from her being an unhealthy Woman? " He
said, " Has she been an unhealthy Woman? " He
had attended her a very short Time. I always
consider it my Duty, if there is Time, to apply to
the Board for an Order, unless a Woman is taken
ill and there is not Time to apply to the Board;
then I use my Discretion. He asked me whether I
would give him an Order; I said " No; I will apply to
the Board for it; " and I promised him I would, and

I did so.

The Board refused it?

Yes, in the Manner I have stated.

*Mr. Ruddock did not tell you it was essentially
necessary?*

No.

You are quite sure that is the Case?

Yes.

*Mr. Ruddock did not tell you that there were any
Circumstances about her late Illness which rendered
it necessary?*

I am positive he did not.

*You did not state to the Board that Mr. Ruddock
requested you to apply?*

No, I did not.

Why did you not?

I did not consider it necessary.

*You thought that Mr. Ruddock would not dislike
the Job?*

Certainly not.

*You did not think that he thought it necessary on
account of any Circumstances affecting Charlotte
Allen?*

Not the least.

*Did he desire you to apply for an Order from the
Board?*

When I said I would do so he said " Will you? "

*Did you inform the Board Mr. Ruddock desired
you to apply?*

No.

*When you applied to the Board for the Order in
what Terms did you make the Application?*

If your Lordships will allow me, I will show
you the Report of the Application. On the
Twelfth Week, June 9th or 16th, I applied for a
Midwife and Nurse for the Confinement of
Charlotte Allen; at the same Time I reported that
I had given temporary Relief to the Amount of
Sixpence, which was allowed, and an Order was
made on this Application.

778

*Your Application was not for a Medical Man, but
for a Midwife and Nurse?*

Yes.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

20

Did not Mr. Ruddock desire you to apply for an Order for him to attend?

We do not make that Distinction.

You mean either a Man or a Woman?

Yes.

Did not you make another Application, when you applied for a Medical Man?

No.

You applied for a Midwife and a Nurse, and you then suggested that it would be desirable to have a Man and not a Woman?

Yes; that was my Idea.

When this Discussion took place with Mr. Poole were you there?

Yes.

What did they pay the Female Midwife?

Five Shillings.

And a Man Midwife is Ten Shillings?

Yes.

Your written Application does not state any thing about Mr. Ruddock's Attendance?

No.

That was Matter of Conversation at the Board?

It was, at this Time.

Was there a Discussion whether that Midwife should be a Man or a Woman?

I intended this Application for Mr. Ruddock's Attendance.

You made a Deposition on Oath before Mr. Weale, the Assistant Commissioner, relative to this Circumstance?

Yes.

In that you state, " On the 9th of June he the Deponent reported the Case to the Board, whose Order was that he should send her a Woman Midwife "?

Yes, that was the Case. The only Reason that I can state for that was, that the greatest Part of the poor Women in our Neighbourhood are attended by Women in their Confinements, and that was the Reason why Mr. Poole suggested that a Woman should attend her.

Did you state that in your Opinion a Medical Man should attend?

I did. I said I thought it would be much better that a Medical Man should attend her; as this Woman was so much affected in her Manner she would make a Fuss if a Medical Man did not attend her; but the Board said, " *If a Medical Man was wanted a Medical Man would be sent.* " I never refused one in any fit Case.

When you said to Mr. Ruddock you supposed he would attend her you supposed the Board would give his Services?

Yes.

Do you know a Woman of the Name of Betty Cummings?

Yes.

She was a Pauper and had Medical Assistance, had not she?

Yes.

Did you give Notice to the Medical Officer to discontinue his Attendance on Betty Cummings?

Yes.

Why did you do that?

Because this Woman is a Woman of most reprobate Character; a very bad Character. At that Time she had had Two Bastards, and she is a Woman that has been hanging on the Parish for Six or Seven Years. The Guardian of the

779

Parish, and many others, who knew her well, had been speaking to me about her, that she was imposing, and that she ought not to be attended by the Medical Officer. I saw Mr. Ruddock in the Street; I said, " I should think you may discontinue attending her, for I am told that she does not need it. " He said, " I think that I know best about that; " and he continued to attend her about Three Weeks after that.

Did Mr. Ruddock attend Betty Cummings at the Time he contracted to attend the Poor, for Three Weeks from 24th June 1836?

Yes.

Did he contract again for the next Year?

Yes, he did.

Did he continue to attend her after he had contracted again?

I cannot answer that Question.

Had he attended her for some Time before the First Contract expired?

I cannot say; I know he had attended her previously.

You refused Medical Relief afterwards to Three or Four Persons; One of them was Charles Coles?

Yes.

Charles Coles had a Child ill?

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

21

Yes. He came to me one Evening, when it was very late, between Nine and Ten o'Clock, in the Summer Days, and asked me to give him an Order for a Child who was ill. I said, "What is the Matter with your Child, Charles?" he said, "I do not know; it is bad." I began to say, "Perhaps it will do in the Morning." He began to talk very roughly to me, and told me his Master had sent him to me; and if I did not give him an Order he would report me to the Commissioners.

Who is the Master?

Mr. King, a Partner with Mr. Ruddock; he takes care of his Horse, and does any thing out of Doors for him. I told him that perhaps there would be no Hurry till the Morning; but he began to talk very loudly to me. But the next Day the Child was running about the Streets, as I heard, and he never came again.

Do you know how long Mr. Ruddock continued to attend Betty Cummings?

No.

Do you know whether he continued to attend her after the Three Weeks were over?

I cannot tell.

Would it be in his Book?

I do not know; but I know his Attendance during the Three Weeks was very frequent.

Would his Attendance after that be in his Book?

Yes.

Then if it is not in his Book he did not attend her afterward?

No.

How came you to put off Coles when he came for Medical Relief?

I thought if there was any thing very particular in a Hurry about the Child his Master would give him something for the Night till the next Morning; but he began to be very violent with me, and went away.

The Child was dead the next Day, was not it?

No; it was playing about the Streets the next Day, as I was informed.

Was Coles a Pauper?

No, he was not.

He was at Work for Mr. King, the Surgeon?

Yes.

780

What were his Wages?

8s. or 9s. a Week; and his Wife is a

Washerwoman.

What Family had he?

He had Three Children; his eldest Boy was at Work.

Had he ever had Medical Relief from the Parish?

He had had some Time previous, when he had an Accident; his Arm was hurt.

What do you reckon his Wife's Earnings?

I cannot say.

Washerwomen earn a good deal if they have much Employment?

Yes, in some Places. She takes in Washing.

Has she a Mangle?

I think not.

What are the Boy's Wages?

I suppose not much.

Half a Crown?

No, not so much. I should think he is not above Ten Years old.

Eighteen-pence?

Quite as much as that.

Do you remember Mr. Ruddock applying to you on the 14th of June for some Orders for Medical Attendance on several Persons?

Yes; he brought a List in his Hand.

What did you say to that?

He came to me on Saturday Morning, and said he had got a List of some Names, and requested I would give an Order for him to attend them. I looked over the List, and I answered there were some that I should hesitate about. I said "Perhaps there is no Hurry for Half an Hour." He said, "I wish you would give me those Orders as speedily as you can; I want to go away." I only wished to have some Conversation with Mr. Poole, an ex-officio Guardian, who attended the Board Meetings, to know what I was to do in giving Orders. Mr. King or Mr. Ruddock saw me going by the House, and called me back. When I came back Mr. Ruddock asked me if I had got those Orders for him. I told him, No, I had not; I said that he should have them by - and - by. Mr. King asked me where I was going: "Are you going to Poole's?" he lived a little below. I said I was. He said, "I do not care what Mr. Poole says about it; he has no right to interfere with you; use your own Discretion." Some other few Words passed, and I left his House, and went down and found Mr. Poole engaged, and returned home again. Mr. Ruddock saw me at my Door, and called across the Street, and said, "If you do not give me those Orders I shall report you." I said, "I will give you Orders

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

22

for Three or Four of those Paupers; the others, I think, I shall not give you the Orders for till they apply to me and I see them, and if I consider that they want an Order I will give them one." I gave him the Orders for Three or Four then, and the others Two or Three Days afterwards.

Was Mr. Ruddock in the habit, before those Three Weeks, of bringing you a List of Paupers to be attended?

Never.

Has he done it since?

No.

How long were those People kept waiting for the Orders?

I gave Orders for some who I knew were ill immediately; the others that I did not consider wanted immediate Attendance I gave them in the Course of that Day and the following Day; I do not think it went further than that.

Can you state positively that it did not go further than the Second Day before you gave the Orders?

I think it did not go beyond the Third Day in any Case.

781

Can you state positively that it did not go beyond the Third Day?

The Book will tell; I think it did not.

What are their Names?

George Weare was one.

Why did you delay giving Orders for Two Days?

Because those People were not very ill.

You were told by the Medical Men they were ill, were you not?

He merely gave me a List of Six or Seven.

You knew yourself that they were ill?

Some of them.

Did you know at all the Nature of their Disorder?

No, I cannot say that I did. There were Two or Three that I found in the List that I knew were very ill, and I did not hesitate to give him an Order.

Which were those?

Davis and Hannah Sweet, and I think John Trickey. The others I waited till they made Application themselves.

They had never applied to you?

No; this was the Day after the Interview between the Board of Guardians and the Doctors.

Was not your Reason for declining to give Orders that there was no Agreement at the Time between the Board and the Doctors?

Certainly, I considered that was a good Reason.

Was not that your only Reason?

Yes; and I rather considered that they were bound to apply to me for the Order. The Medical Men were under quite a new Contract with the Board.

You thought it would be a Check upon the Medical Persons if you refused to give the Orders till the Paupers applied?

It was my Duty to give Orders when the Paupers applied; not to give them to the Medical Men.

Those Paupers had not applied?

Not One of those to whom I gave the Orders.

Nor any one on their Behalf?

No; that was the List brought by the Medical Officer to me.

It was a Matter of Duty in you not to give an unnecessary Order?

Yes.

That was a Check on the Bills they were to make during that Time?

If the Medical Officer had been allowed to bring me a List of Six or Seven Persons every Day, without Application from the Paupers, they would have got a long Bill.

A Medical Man of any Character would not do that, would he?

I never knew him do it before.

The usual Course is for the Pauper to apply?

Yes.

Did any injurious Consequences result from those Persons not being immediately attended?

No.

In the previous Year the Medical Officers had been paid by Salary?

Yes.

How long had they been paid by Bills?

Three Weeks.

782

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

23

When the Medical Officers were paid by Salary were they at that Time in the habit of waiting till the poor People applied themselves, or did you allow the Medical Officer to go upon his own Application?

The Course was quite otherwise; they always made Application, and he was very cautious not to attend any one without an Order. I do not know that he has attended Five Cases without an Order first from me or some competent Person, during that Time.

In the former Year he had never attended any Case without the Pauper applying to you, though he was paid by Salary?

I cannot say any Case, there may have been a Case where he went without an Order from me; but he makes it a Rule always to wait for his Order, and he is very particular with the Pauper; he will not attend without an Order from me or some competent Person.

Did he ever get an Order from the Overseer?

Sometimes when I was out of the Way.

Did he attend to that?

Yes.

Are the Overseers in your District aware that they have a Right to give Orders?

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mrs. MARY WAITES is called in, and examined as follows :

YOU are the Wife of Mr. Waites, the Relieving Officer?

I am.

Do you remember a Woman of the Name of Mary Date coming to you about Charlotte Allen on the 30th of June 1837?

Yes.

What did she say to you?

She came and said that Charlotte Allen was in Labour, and wished to know whom she was to have as Midwife, and I told her she was to have Kitty Walker. She said that Charlotte Allen wished very much she could be allowed Kitty Walker; I told her she certainly should be allowed her.

She did not express any Wish to be attended by a Doctor?

No; she particularly wished to have Kitty Walker.

You are sure that she did not ask for an Order to

have a Doctor?

No; for the Person who came particularly said it was her wish to have Kitty Walker. She went away and sent for the Midwife, which was the Sister to Mary Date. She came back again in about Half an Hour, and wished to know who was to pay Kitty Walker, as nothing was said about that; I told her my Husband would certainly see her paid.

You heard of her Delivery on the 1st of July, the Saturday?

Yes.

Did they tell you that she had done well during her Time?

I begged at the same Time that she would come in the course of the Afternoon and let me know how she was going on; I also begged that Kitty Walker would not leave her. Her Sister told me that she certainly should not leave her; and I begged her to let me know how she went on. About Seven o'Clock she told me that she was going on very well, but not then confined. On the Saturday Morning she came about Ten o'Clock - my Husband happened at the Time to be in the House; she said she was confined about Eleven the Night before, and was doing quite well.

She did not tell you there was any thing particular in the Circumstance of her Delivery?

No. My Husband only sent Mary Date back with the Groats. We heard nothing more till Monday; then there was a Woman named

783

Betty Wooley up to get Charlotte Allen's 1s. 6d. and a Loaf, said something to my Husband about some Pain she had, and that she thought that she had better have a Doctor; and my Husband desired her to call on me, saying he should like that I should go and see her. This Woman came up from the Church, and begged that I would come and see her some Time in the Day; and I said I would any Time in the Day if she was poorly; and she complained that she had been in Pain sometimes.

At what Time of the Day did she call?

I should think about Eleven o'Clock; it was after my Husband was giving out the Bread. I was at Dinner before I went up, when Kitty Walker came up and said there was nothing the matter; that she had been to see the Woman; that she only wanted some Castor Oil.

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

24

She said she did not know whether she must get it herself, or whether my Husband would allow it I said, " I have no Doubt he would allow it." He sent my Daughter for it; and we heard afterwards that the Oil had had its desired Effect, and she was very well.

Was any thing said about any thing particular having happened in her Delivery?

No. Kitty Walker made an Observation, " Until she has as many Children as you and me she will know no better;" that she was very tedious, but she thought there was nothing particular the matter. We heard nothing more— only sent her Biscuits on Tuesday— till Wednesday Evening; then the Midwife Woman came and said that Charlotte was still complaining, and she thought, for the Satisfaction of Charlotte Allen, she should like that I should go and see her; and I went with her and examined her Person well, and could find nothing about her wrong, except that she was weak. I said, " You would like for the Doctor, Charlotte?" she said, Yes, she should, for Satisfaction.

There was nothing particular in her Appearance?

No. When I came back I said I did not like to deny the Doctor for Fear of what People would say; but she appeared as comfortable as any Woman could be.

Was she out of Bed?

She had been out of Bed; on the Sunday she went out and in again, not to stay. I said, " You would like to have the Doctor, Charlotte?" She said she should, for there was Pain sometimes; and she thought there was something that was not right; that she was in Pain now and then.

You could see nothing?

No; I inquired into every Particular.

You have had several Children?

I have had Ten Children; I had Six of them with a Midwife, and Four with a Doctor. There is not a Doctor for One Woman out of Twenty.

Your Husband did give an Order for Mr. Ruddock to attend?

He did. The Midwife came from Charlotte Allen's House for an Order, and went from our House to the Doctor; he did not hesitate a Moment; we thought there would be some People perhaps who would say she ought to have a Doctor. We heard she was lying in very comfortably. I did not think any thing of her being in Pain sometimes.

You heard afterwards that there was something particular?

Not very particular; the Doctor made a great deal of it when he came.

Did he say that there was any thing wrong when he came?

He said it was Child-bed Fever. I never was more surprised in my Life, for I had inquired into every Particular, and she was looking very comfortable, and had as beautiful a Breast of Milk as I ever saw.

Did the Doctor examine her when you were there?

No, not when I was there. I examined with the Midwife. I saw her once afterwards.

When was that?

On the Thursday I went up.

784

Do you know whether the Medical Man had examined her that Time?

He did not examine her the same Night. She told him she should wish that he should examine her. He was going out of the Room, and told her he would send her something; she said, " I want you to examine me. " Charlotte Allen told him she felt an Uneasiness; he said, " Oh, the Morning would do for that;" and the next Morning I heard that he did.

Did she complain of a bearing down?

There was nothing to be seen; but I believe she did; she felt in Pain.

Did she tell you that she had felt that?

She said she felt an Uneasiness in that Part.

Is that common with Persons in that Situation?

It was not a constant Pain, only at Times; it is certainly common for some Days; and I found she could make Water and every thing. I could not see that there was any thing unfavourable about her.

Did you ever examine her Person afterwards?

No, I did not.

You were not present when the Surgeon examined her?

No.

When did you first hear there was something wrong?

Only on that Night when she complained.

You did not hear any thing afterwards?

No; only that I have heard since it was

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

25

supposed to be something from the Bladder;
some trifling thing.

Is Kitty Walker a Woman of Experience [?].

Yes; she had put to Bed about Fifty, I think,
before Charlotte Allen.

*When you were confined yourself had you this
Woman to attend you?*

No, I never had this Woman. I had her
Mother for Six; she was an extraordinary
Woman. I have had a Medical Man for the last
Four.

*You were delivered by a Woman of the first Six,
and by a Man of Four?*

Yes.

*Was Kitty Walker anxious that a Doctor should
come to Charlotte Allen on the Wednesday?*

Yes; for her Satisfaction, as Charlotte kept
complaining she thought she had better.

*Did she think herself there was any Necessity for
it?*

She did not herself think there was any thing
particular; she could not tell what she
complained of; she had examined herself, and
could not see anything.

*Did not the Medical Man discover that there was
something wrong the Moment he came to her?*

I believe the next Morning he did,

*Did Kitty Walker think she had any Child - bed
Fever?*

No; I believe every one was surprised to hear
that. She had no more Fever about her than any
Woman I ever saw; she looked quite White, and
had a beautiful Breast of Milk.

Did you never see her with any Fever?

No, not at any Time that I saw her.

When did you see her last?

The Thursday; she was brought to Bed the
Friday before.

I

No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

785

KITTY WALKER is called in, and examined
as follows :

YOU live at Nether Stowey?

Yes.

You practise as a Midwife?

Yes.

How long have you practised as a Midwife?

About Nine or Ten Years.

Was your Mother a Midwife also?

Yes.

*What Knowledge you have in the Matter you have
acquired from your Mother?*

Yes.

*Have you studied at all under any Medical
Person?*

No.

*How many Women have you delivered in the last
Five or Six Years?*

I think it is Sixty up to this Time.

*Were there any Cases of bad Labour among those
Persons?*

Yes.

Have you had any Accident happen?

No, except this Charlotte Allen.

The others have all done well?

Very well.

*Do you remember being called to attend Charlotte
Allen?*

Yes.

When was that?

The 30th of last June, on Friday.

You did attend her?

Yes.

Was she a long Time in Labour?

No; I was called about Two in the Day, and
she was confined about Eleven at Night.

Did you remain with her afterwards?

Two or Three Hours.

Was there any thing very difficult in the Labour?

Nothing at all; a very favourable Labour.

Did the Child come quite well?

Yes.

Had you any occasion to use any Force?

No; I called it a natural good Labour.

Any Instrument?

No, none at all.

You do not make use of Instruments, probably?

Oh no; when Instruments are wanted I send
for a Medical Man.

You left her Two or Three Hours afterwards?

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

26

Yes.

Who was attending upon her?

The Nurse, Mary Date.

That is your Sister?

Yes.

786

Did you call upon her on the Saturday?

Yes.

That was the following Day?

Yes.

Was she then well?

She was very comfortable, and had passed a
very comfortable Night.

Did she complain of any Pain?

No; she was sitting right up, taking her
Breakfast.

Did you understand she had been up?

No, not that Day; not till the Sunday.

*Early on the Sunday Morning did Mary Date call
upon you?*

On the Sunday Morning.

What did she say to you?

She said that Charlotte Allen complained of a
Bowel Complaint.

You went down to her?

Yes; she complained of a Bowel Complaint.

That is to say, a Pain in the Bowels?

Yes.

What did you do?

I fomented her with Flannel and warm
Water; she was quite comfortable after the
Bathing. I staid with her Two or Three Hours.

You gave her some opening Medicine?

Some Senna Tea.

Did you examine her at that Time?

Yes.

Was there any thing to be seen?

No; every thing was right and proper.

*You are sure there was no Symptom of any thing
wrong?*

Yes.

How long did you remain with her?

Two or Three Hours, till I left her quite

comfortable, and desired her to take care of
herself, and not to take any Cold.

Did you charge her not to get up?

Yes.

*Did you hear that she had been up in the
meantime?*

I found her up myself on the Monday; but
she had been up on the Saturday. I told her it
was a Matter of great Consequence.

You called upon her again the same Morning?

Yes, I did.

How was she then?

She was better.

Did you give her some Medicine?

Some more Senna Tea, because the first did
not have its Effect.

When did you see her again after that?

The Monday.

At what Time?

Nearly the Middle of the Day.

What did you do on that Occasion?

She complained of being in Pain; and I asked
her if she had taken Cold; and my Sister told me
she had found her out of Bed. I thought it very
improper for her to be out of Bed, and I applied
to the Relieving Officer's Wife to send her, other
opening Medicine, for the Senna Tea did not
take effect; and when I came back and found

787

her out of Bed I told her it was very im-
proper; that I considered she had brought this
Sickness upon her own self.

She took some Castor Oil?

Yes, and that operated; the next Morning I
called again; she was easier and better.

When did she complain of being worse again?

On the Wednesday,

What did she complain of?

She complained of Pain in her Bowels
sometimes.

*When you say a Pain in her Bowels, you mean a
Pain any where about that Region, which would have
the Appearance, to a Person who did not know, of a
Pain in her Bowels?*

She did not complain of any thing particular
except her Bowels; no lower down.

Did you know Charlotte Allen before?

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

27

Yes.
Did you know her when she was attended by Mr. Ruddock during her Confinement?
Yes.
What was the Nature of her Complaint?
A Liver Complaint.
Being bound in her Bowels?
Yes.
You thought it was a Continuation of the same Thing?
Yes, I did.
When did you apply to Mr. Waites to send a Doctor to her?
On the Wednesday Evening.
Why did you apply for the Doctor?
Because it was Charlotte Allen's particular Wish for Mr. Ruddock to attend her.
For the Complaint she made of the Pain in her Bowels you wished it?
Yes; I thought it would be greater Satisfaction to me.
Did you examine her that Evening?
Yes, in the Presence of Mrs. Waites.
You were satisfied there was nothing wrong then?
Yes; every thing was right and proper.
Did she complain of a bearing down?
No; and if there was such a Thing it must have been seen.
When did Mr. Ruddock come?
That same Evening; I waited for an Order, and fetched him myself.
When he came did he inquire into all Particulars?
Yes; and he ordered warm Water and Flannel to foment her Bowels, just as I had directed before.
He did not examine her personally?
No, he did not.
Did you ask him to do so?
Yes, I did.
What did he say?
He said nothing particular.
At what Hour did he come?
About Six.

Did she wish him to examine her Person at this Time?
Yes; she had a Desire, and did ask him after I proposed it.
Did he say that Evening what was the Matter with her?
No.
Did he tell you?
No.
Did he say she had any Fever?
No.
You asked Mr. Ruddock the next Morning what was the matter with her?
Yes. He said there was no Fault whatever of mine.
Did he tell you what it was?
No, he did not to me.
The next Day, the Friday, Mr. King and Mr. Ruddock both came?
Yes. I saw them both after they saw Charlotte Allen. I asked Mr. King what he thought was the matter; he said, "No Fault of yours, Kitty Walker; that had he or Mr. King attended the Labour the same Circumstance might have happened to him, and it had happened to them."
Did he say what that Circumstance was?
No.
Did he examine her?
Yes; they had examined her that Morning.
Did they examine her again the next Day?
Yes.
When did you first hear that Charlotte Allen was suffering from coming down of the Womb?
On the Friday.
Had you an Opportunity of examining her after that?
Yes, I had.
Was there an Appearance then of the coming down of the Womb?
No, there was not. There was a Swelling of the Bowels, but nothing to be seen whatever.

Was it different from what it had been when Mrs. Waites and you examined her?

Yes; there was a Swelling of the Bowels, which I had not seen there before; but as to any thing coming down, or different, there was not

There was Light enough then to examine her?
Yes, there was.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

28

any thing.

Did she complain of great Pain in those Parts?

Sometimes she did, and sometimes she felt
easy.

*Had she the usual Comforts Women have under
those Circumstances?*

A great deal more than I have seen in many
Cases. I never saw any thing wanting : there was
Arrow Root, and Sago, and Sugar, and Meat,
and every Comfort.

Have you seen her since that Time at all?

Yes, a great many Times.

How is she now?

Better, a great deal; she has been better ever
since she left Stowey, that she has been out of
the Care of Mr. Ruddock.

*Did Mr. King and Mr. Ruddock both tell you the
same Thing?*

Yes, they did.

789

i?

Yes, they did.

*What did you say to them when they told you
this?*

I asked Mr. King what it proceeded from; and
he said these Circumstances would happen, and
did frequently happen, and might have
happened after them, and had happened after
them and other Surgeons too.

Were you surprised when they told you this?

Yes, for I never saw such a Thing as that; I
have never seen such a Thing, and I have
examined her at different Times, and in the
Presence of Mrs. Waites.

*Did you tell him you were surprised they should
say this?*

Yes.

Had you much Talk with them?

Yes, I had, several Times.

You say she is now much better?

Yes; and as well as she has been for these Five
or Six Years.

*Is there any Appearance at all of what they
conceived was the Matter with her?*

No; there never was any Appearance of such
a Thing at all.

Have you ever seen such a Thing?

Yes, I have.

There was no such Appearance about her?

No.

You examined her before Mr. Ruddock and
Mr. King saw her?

Yes.

You have examined her since?

Yes; and Doctor Ward from Bridgwater has
examined her, and he says there is no Injury
whatever from her Confinement.

Doctor Ward told you so?

Yes, he did.

When was that?

I think about a Month before she was moved
to the House at Bridgwater.

Was not it before she went away to her Friends?

Yes.

*Did you frequently call upon her before she went
away from Stowey, when she was under Mr.
Ruddock's Care?*

Yes; then I saw her every Day almost.

*Did you ever find any thing unpleasant or
offensive?*

No; I have seen her Linen, and it was quite
sweet and wholesome; and with any Laceration
whatever that did not appear at all likely.

Has Mr. Ruddock been the Parish Doctor long?

No, he has not.

*Did Doctor Ward tell you she was now perfectly
well?*

He told me she was perfectly well from her
Confinement; and he said if she had been under
his Care she should have been well long before.

That he told you at the Time?

Yes.

When did Mr. Ward tell you?

The Time he examined her.

790

That was before she went away?

Yes.

*Have you seen her since she has been in the
Workhouse?*

No.

*You have not seen her since she came back from
over the Hills?*

No.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

29

Did you see her examined by Mr. Standert?
No.
Do you know Mr. Standert?
No, I do not.
He came with Mr. King?
I did not see him. I have attended with Mr.
King at difficult Labours to assist him instead of
the Doctor.
What Mr. King?
Mr. King of Stowey.
Is the Child living?
Yes.
Did she suckle the Child during her Illness?
Yes, and had plenty of Milk.
Has she always continued to suckle the Child?
Yes.
Can a Woman in Childbed Fever suckle a Child?
Oh dear no.
Is it a fine Child?
A very fine Child.
And she has been a good Nurse to it?
Yes.
Has the Child grown?
Yes, a very fine Baby.
*Did you see her shortly before she went over the
Hills?*
Yes; she got up at Four o'Clock in the
Morning herself to get ready to go in the Cart.
The Child has never been brought up by Hand?
No, not at all.
The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Mr. J. Newman.
Mr. JAMES NEWMAN is called in, and
examined as follows :
*YOU are the Relieving Officer of the First District
of the Bridgwater Union?*
Yes.
*Do you remember being applied to by the Wife of
John Cook on the 14th of July 1837?*
Yes.
She wanted a Medical Officer to attend her Child?
Yes.

Did you give her an Order?
I did not on her first Application.
Why did you not?
The first Reason was that I thought the

Husband ought to find Medical Relief

791

for his Child; that being a Tradesman, it was his
Place; and I was under Mr. J. Newman. some
Difficulty as no Surgeon was appointed for that
District.
What do you mean by a Tradesman?
A Shoemaker.
*You mean that he ought to be able to afford it
himself?*
Yes.
You mean by a Tradesman a Mechanic?
Yes.
*Did you inquire at all into the Man's
Circumstances?*
I did.
Did you learn what he earned?
His general Earnings were about 12s. a Week
himself, and he had a Boy worked at the Trade,
and he got about 3s. a Week, and the Wife
herself was a Charwoman, and sometimes
earned a Shilling or Two a Week.
*That would be 15s. a Week; was that the Case if he
had full Work; and had he constant Employment at
that Rate?*
I understood that was what he generally
earned, because the Wife stated he could earn
more if he had full Employment; and, on
inquiring since, I have found he need not be
without full Employment.
What Family had he?
Three Children; and only this One but what
was capable of working.
Did you know the Man before?
I did not.
*Did he come afterwards and bring a Note from Mr
Parker?*
The Wife did.
What did Mr. Parker say in his Note?
He stated that he had seen the Child, and it
appeared very ill, and in want of Medical
Assistance.
Did you give an Order?
Not immediately; I promised the Woman I
would come in a very short Time and see the
Child.
Did you?
I did.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

30

How long after?

I suppose somewhat more than Half an Hour.

Did you see the Child?

I did.

In what State was the Child?

It appeared very ill.

What did you do?

I then went to the Place where the Guardians were then assembling, with an Intention of reporting the Case to them for their Direction.

Did you report the Case?

I had not an Opportunity of doing it immediately; they were then electing the Surgeons; they were in Confusion. I saw One of the Guardians soon after, Mr. Dally, One of the Guardians of the Parish of Bridgwater; he directed me to give an Order; but I had written the Order before I saw him, with the Intention of giving it without that Direction.

The Reason you did not give an Order in the first instance was, that you were in doubt whether he was not a Person who ought to pay his own Medical Expenses, and you were in Uncertainty about the Medical Officers at that Time?

Yes.

792

He had never applied to you before?

No. I was satisfied, from the Man's Ability to work, he might get Relief himself without coming to the Parish.

Did the Wife tell you that his Earnings were 12s. a Week?

Yes; that was about the Average.

He might, if he had full Work, have earned more?

Yes, considerably more. I have since inquired of his Master : he has told me he is capable of earning much more Wages in case he is disposed to work; but I believe he is not at all Times disposed to work.

Can he at all Times get Work?

He can.

You are sure of that?

I am, from Information I got from the Master, that he could at that Time get Work from him.

What is the Master's Name?

Cross.

How long was it after the Application was made to you for the Order before the Order was given?

I think about Two Hours.

From the First Application to the Time of giving the Order was only Two Hours?

About Two or Three Hours.

Was not it considerably more than that?

Not much more.

Was it Three?

I think it was not Three.

Can you take upon you to say it was not Three Hours?

I made no particular Observation as to the Time; but, as far as I can recollect, I think it did not exceed Two Hours.

Your Reason for giving the Order could not be in consequence of this Man's Circumstances, for his Circumstances were not changed in those Three Hours?

No; but seeing the Child was very ill, I thought I would break through my former Intention, and give an Order.

After that you communicated with Mr. Dally?

Yes.

He being one of the Guardians?

Yes.

Was not your principal Reason for declining giving the Order in the first place because the Medical Men were not settled with by the Guardians?

That was not the principal Reason; had the Medical Men been appointed I should have hesitated to give an Order for such a Person.

From the Condition in Life of the Applicant, and not the State of Disease the Child was in?

Yes.

Were any Directions given you with respect to giving Orders to the Medical Officers under the Circumstances you have stated?

The principal Direction was only a Repetition of what we had been formerly directed to do, and that was to use Discretion in giving those Orders.

Was there any thing said to you about its being more expensive than it should have been?

Not a Word; the only Direction we had was that the Surgeons were not under Contract,

793

and therefore we must use Discretion; but at the same Time not to let any deserving Case be

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

31

neglected.

Was there any thing about being sparing?

Not to my Recollection.

Have you been long in the Neighbourhood?

I had lived Eight Years in the neighbouring
Parish.

*Previous to the Month of May 1837, when there
was a Contract for the Surgeons, were there any
general Directions from the Board as to Cases which
appeared to you of Urgency, where you doubted
whether the Head of the Family was in
Circumstances to maintain himself?*

I do not remember receiving any particular
Directions about that.

*What would have been your Practice if you found
a Person apparently in a very dangerous State in
want of Medical Relief, and you doubted whether he
was a Pauper?*

If a Person applied to me in Circumstances
which required my giving him an Order I
should have done it; but if a Person applied to
me who I thought ought not to require it I
should not give him an Order. That was my
general Practice.

*Would you have withheld Medical Relief till you
were satisfied he was entitled to it by Law, or given
him the Relief, and inquired into that after wards?*

It would have depended upon the
Information I had of the State of the Individual;
if I had any Doubt of the Case I should refuse
the Order. I have on some Occasions consulted
some of the Guardians or Persons who I thought
would advise me what to do in Cases of Doubt
and Difficulty. I do so at the present Time.

*It was not your Practice to order Relief if a Man
was not a proper Object, and to make him pay for it?*

Very few such Cases as that have occurred.

*Is not every Order you give for Medical Relief
considered a Loan until the weekly Meeting of the
Board?*

If I find that Persons are in Circumstances to
pay, I sometimes give them as Loans until the
Board Day; then the Board deal with them
according to Circumstances.

*Are you present at the Board when your District
comes under Consideration?*

I am.

*Is not the Question put to the Board, will they
allow or disallow the Medical Relief you have given
in every Case?*

It is regularly entered in the Book, and comes

before the Board as Relief given; and they
confirm or disallow it at the Time.

Do you know Cook?

I do not.

Do you know his Character?

I only know from Information I have
received.

Do you know the Case of Sarah Winslade?

I recollect something about the Case.

*Did anybody apply to you for an Order for Mr.
King to attend her?*

Yes.

Who were the Persons?

They were Two Women.

Did you give an Order?

I did.

Did you give it the First Time they applied?

I did.

Are you quite sure of that?

I am quite sure of that.

794

At what Time was it?

About Twelve o'Clock at Night.

They had not applied to you before that?

No.

Did Mr. King attend her?

He did.

You gave an order the Moment they applied for it?

I did not give a written Order; I sent a
Message.

That was given on the First Application?

Yes; but I was informed afterwards that Two
Women went to Mr. King to ask him to attend
about Ten in the Evening; but they did not come
to me.

How long have you been Relieving Officer?

Ever since the Formation of the Union.

Are you a Person from that Part of the Country?

My native Place is about Six Miles from
Bridgwater.

*Do you know what has become of Sarah Winslade
since?*

Yes; she is now with her Husband.

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

Day 7, 26 June 1838

Evidence of Jonathan Toogood, p 753; James Franklin Waites, P 770; Mrs Mary Waites, p 782; Kitty
Walker, p 785; James Newman, p 790.

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 24/04/2021

32

Did she go to the Bath Lunatic Asylum?

She did.

*How long after Mr. King attended her on this
Application you have referred to?*

I should think about Two Months.

How long did she stay there?

She stayed there about Eight Months.

Did she come home quite well?

Yes; she came home at Lady Day last.

Have you seen her since?

I have seen her since she came home; and I
have seen her Husband also.

;How is she?

She is tolerably well, and going on very well.

*If you heard of a Case of urgent Necessity, should
not you give an Order, without being quite sure that
the Person was a Pauper?*

If I was satisfied in my Mind that there was a
Necessity for giving an Order, and the Person
who made the Application could not pay a
Surgeon, I should not hesitate at all; if I have any
Doubt in the Case I do not immediately give an
Order.

The Case put is a Case of urgent Necessity?

It quite depends upon whether the Applicant
is a proper Person or not.

*You would be decided rather by what you suppose
to be the Station of the Person than the Necessity of
the Case?*

Taking it altogether, I should be guided more
by the Family than by his Earnings. Cook
appeared to be a person who had only One
Child who did not get its Living : for a Person
that had Half a Dozen young Children I should
not have hesitated for a Moment.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

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