

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

1

839

Die Jovis, 5° Julii 1838.

The Lord WHARNCLIFFE in the Chair.

Evidence on the Operation of the Poor Law
Amendment Act.

HUGH CHATLEY STANDERT Esquire is
called in, and examined as H. C. Standert, Esq.

YOU reside at Taunton?

I do.

You are a Surgeon?

Yes, and Physician.

Have you been long in Practice there?

Above Thirty Years.

*Have you been within these few Months called to
examine the Person of a Woman called Charlotte
Allen, living in the Bridgwater Union?*

I was called to visit a Person I think of the
Name of Charlotte Allen at Stowey.

When was that?

It was some Time I think in February last; I
cannot recollect the precise Day.

Had you been informed of her having had a Child?

I had.

Did you examine her Person?

I did.

*Did you find that any Injury had been done to it
in any way?*

I found there had been a Laceration of the
Perinæum.

*Are you quite certain there had been a Laceration
of the Perinæum?*

Yes, I examined it, and found there had been
a Laceration.

You can speak to that Fact?

I can.

*Was there any thing else, with respect to her, that
you have to state?*

The Woman appeared to be in a State of
extremely ill Health. I found her in Bed; and I
understood she had been very ill a long Time
previous.

Was there any offensive Discharge from her?

Not to any Amount at that Time; I did not
observe any great Discharge at the Time. The
Woman stated herself to be better when I saw
her than she had been.

*Would that Laceration of the Perinæum produce a
Discharge which would be offensive?*

It would at some Periods; but this Laceration
had taken place for a considerable Period, and
the Discharge was then not great. In fact, I
believe, she had prepared her Person for the
Examination; when I came in there was some
Discharge.

*Is that Laceration of the Perinæum an Injury
which can be cured, or not?*

It gets better after a Time; the lacerated Parts
become again covered with the proper
Integuments, and a Healing takes place; it was
in a State of healing when I saw it.

840 *So that it might be perfectly healed, and no
Discharge might take place of an offensive Nature?*

Certainly, it was in a healing State.

*You cannot state at the Time how far she had had
a Prolapsus Uteri?*

She stated that she had had a Prolapsus Uteri;
but she had been lying in Bed when I saw her,
and the Uterus was not at that Time in a
prolapsed State; it was in a languid State.

You could not tell whether she had had it or not?

No.

*Did she complain of not having been properly
attended to during her Lying - in?*

No; she said very little upon the Subject. I
merely examined her then State, and examined
into her present Symptoms.

*You have no Charge of any District in the
Taunton Union?*

No; I never had any.

You belong to the General Medical Association?

Yes; I am a Member of it.

At whose Desire did you examine this Person?

At the Desire of Mr. Ruddock, a Surgeon.

Not at the Desire of Mr. Toogood?

No, not at the Desire of Mr. Toogood. I was
with Mr. Toogood in his Carriage when Mr.
Ruddock asked me to visit the Patient.

*Did Mr. Ruddock accompany you when you
examined that Woman?*

Yes.

Was he present at the Examination?

Yes.

Was Mr. Toogood present at the Examination?

No; it was on my Return from Sir Peregrine
Acland's, having visited his Child with Mr.
Toogood; and I met Mr. Ruddock at Mr. King's
House at Stowey, and went with him to see his
Patient.

Mr. Ruddock was present at the Examination?

He was.

You say there was a Laceration of the Perinæum; the Perinæum is that Part which is between the Vagina and the Rectum?

It is.

Is not such a Laceration very likely to occur at the Delivery of the First Child, when the Woman is not very young, of the Age of Thirty - one, and particularly when the Labour is not very long?

It sometimes occurs, but in what Proportion of Cases I cannot pretend to say.

Is it not under those Circumstances of a Woman of Thirty - one delivered of her First Child, and the Labour not continuing more than Nine Hours, a Case in which such Laceration is very likely to occur?.

It would be more likely to occur in rapid Cases than in such where the Labour was more deliberate.

And that without any Fault or Neglect of the Midwife? Yes, it might, certainly. A Laceration such as you saw is not an irremediable Complaint, is it?

I am not aware of the precise Extent to which it might or might not be remedied.

It is not irremediable?

The Parts will never regain their former State; but when Wounds heal there is a Cicatrice contracting the surrounding Parts, and therefore old Scars are always much less than the original Wound.

841 *Such a Laceration as this, when it is healed, if it shall have healed, would leave a Scar?.*

It would leave the Edges of the Laceration less than at the Time when the Laceration took place; it would be hemmed round.

Would it not be completely healed, and like any other Part?

Yes; I believe the Surface would heal over in Process of Time, depending upon the Health of the Patient.

In that Case there would be no Discharge?

There would be no Discharge from the Wound in that Case.

Would such an Accident as that be properly called Hysteritis Simplex?

Certainly not.

Would it be properly denominated Puerperal Fever?

Certainly not. Both those Diseases might have happened to a Patient in that State.

But that would not have been the proper Denomination for that Disease?

No.

Is Hysteritis Simplex a local Complaint?

No, unless the Inflammation of an internal Organ may be so called.

How soon does Puerperal Fever come on after Delivery?

It is very uncertain in its Attack.

Does not it generally come on soon after a Delivery?

Yes, generally so.

It is a dangerous Complaint?

Yes; but I have known it come on much later, many Days after.

Is it a Complaint that either terminates fatally or is cured within a short Period?

The Period will depend upon the general Constitution of the Patient, and the Degree of the Attack. It is sometimes very rapid in its Course; within a few Hours the Patient will require Treatment of the Disease, varying in its Character greatly; but still I should think properly retaining its Name of Puerperal Fever for a much longer Period.

What is the longest Period you have ever known of Puerperal Fever to continue when not ultimately cured?

Perhaps a Week or Ten Days, or it may be a longer Period.

Have you ever known it remain Three or Four Months?

No.

That is out of the Question?

Yes.

Has a Woman labouring under the Puerperal Fever Milk to feed her Child?

That Secretion varies. I have known Persons under Puerperal Fever suckle, and that there was no Deficiency of Milk; but I have known others where the Secretion of Milk has been entirely suspended; and most usually the Secretion of Milk is suspended or diminished.

It is a rare and novel Case where a Woman labouring under Puerperal Fever is able to suckle her Child, is it not?

No, I should not say it amounted to that; they can sometimes suckle, but it is not a usual Case.

Does it affect the Child's Health if the Mother suffers under Puerperal Fever?

It does not always; it would be very likely to do so; but I have seen Children suffer much less than one would apprehend to be the Case, and perhaps not suffer at all.

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

3

842 *Can you judge from the State of this Woman when you saw her what was the Extent of the Laceration of the Perinæum?*

It was a very considerable Laceration, extending very nearly to the Rectum, but it did not lacerate the Rectum or the Sphincter Muscles attached to it.

If it had extended into the Rectum the Woman would have been in a Situation that would have been incurable?

I should not use that Expression but under certain Limits.

The Integument between the Vagina and the Rectum would have been completely disrupted and would not have been curable?

It would heal even then; there would be no Secretion from the Surface of the Wound; but the Case under those Circumstances would be, that if the Rectum were lacerated it would lose the Power of retaining the Fæces.

Do you mean to say the Vagina and the Rectum would become Two distinct Orifices?

No; I do not think an Union would take place if torn through and through.

If it had been torn through and through, that would justify the Statement that the Accident was irremediable, and that the Woman would be in a State that would render the Remainder of her Life miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to those around her?

Yes; under those Circumstances that would be the Case. She would be offensive because of the Discharge from the Bowels and the mucous Secretions.

The Offence would not arise from any Uterine Discharge, but because she could not retain her Fæces?

Yes; there would be offensive Uterine and Vaginal Discharges also, but the other would be the principal.

That would be the Case if this Integument had been entirely broken asunder in the Labour?

Yes.

You mean so as to open it to the Rectum?

Yes.

Do you consider that the State in which this Woman was, justified the Statement that her Case was irremediable and such as to render the Remainder of her Life miserable to herself and intolerably offensive to all around her?

I should say, as to the Word " irremediable, " the Vagina, I believe, never will recover its

former State; I believe the Opening of the Vagina will extend, and does, I have no Doubt, now extend, very nearly to the Rectum. The Result is, that from the relaxed State of the Uterus, and of the Apparatus for its Support, it must drop down and protrude; and all those Secretions, which in a healthy State only bedew the Parts so as to keep them moist, will in a diseased and relaxed State pour out an increased and vitiated Secretion; and that Secretion will be always more or less fætid, and cannot be retained in the Vagina, but must descend down the Thighs.

You mean to say that the State to which this Woman was reduced by Accident was such that she would be subject to those offensive Discharges, more or less, during her Life?

Yes.

What do you mean by more or less?

Depending on the State of the general Health.

Have you never known a Person to whom that was very near happening, that Part of the Integument being entirely disrupted, perfectly recovered so as to bear Children?

Yes, to bear Children.

And to be in perfect good Health?

Yes, I think I may state that. I have known such a Case, but still suffering from personal Inconvenience from the Secretions requiring a great deal of Care for personal Cleanliness and Comfort. I have never known any one who was not in a very uncomfortable Situation from that Accident.

843 *From offensive Smells?*

Yes, without the greatest Attention and Care.

And in a State to be miserable to herself, and intolerably offensive to those around her?

That would in a Degree depend upon the Care the Individual takes of her own Person; there would be a Liability to that State.

But it would not necessarily occur?

Yes; I think it would necessarily occur in a Degree; it would depend upon the Person taking care of herself and cleaning the Part.

When you saw this Woman, you are not able to state whether there had been a Prolapsus of the Uterus?

It was probable from what was stated; and I believe, from the relaxed State of the Parts, there had been a Prolapsus. I did not make her get up, or probably it would have appeared. I did not make her stand, but the Parts were in such a State that I had reason to believe that the Uterus

would have descended. The Parts were in that State of Relaxation that I believe that was the Case.

You are not able to state it from your own Examination?

No; only that from the Texture of the Parts it appeared to me that that Statement was true.

If a Prolapsus of the Uterus had taken place, was it not much more likely to take place in consequence of the Laceration which had occurred?

No; it depends upon a perfectly different Order of Parts.

You mean to say that that Laceration would not have tended to make her liable to Prolapsus?

It would make the Mode of supporting the Uterus more difficult.

If the Woman had done any thing imprudent within a few Hours of her Delivery, which under such Circumstances was likely to produce Prolapsus, it would have been more likely in consequence of this Laceration of the Perinæum?

I think not. I understand the Question to be this, Whether the Laceration having taken place, that Laceration would occasion a greater Tendency to Prolapsus?

Is not the Prolapsus very likely to occur in consequence of the Woman having imprudently got out of Bed very soon after Delivery?

Yes; Prolapsus would be very likely to occur in consequence of the Woman having got out of Bed very soon after Delivery.

If she had got up imprudently in such a Way that such a Prolapsus was likely to occur, would not that Probability be increased by the Laceration of the Perinæum?

No, I think not.

Those are Two distinct Circumstances?

They are perfectly distinct.

And occasioned by Two different Circumstances?
Perfectly different.

In your Judgment, what do you think occasioned the Laceration of the Perinæum?

It is impossible for me to say.

Was it likely to be occasioned by unskilful Midwifery?

I believe that Lacerations of the Perinæum occur in many Cases where no Art or Skill could prevent them; but certainly an unskilful Person would be much more likely to cause them, or to place a Patient under Circumstances likely to cause them, than if the Process of Labour were superintended by Persons competent to know

the Course of those Functions.

Would not the Prolapsus Uteri be likewise liable to be occasioned by the Want of Skill in the Midwife?

Certainly.

844 *The Woman was in Bed when you saw her?*

Yes.

She was confined in Bed by the State she was in at that Time?

Yes; she was very ill besides; under bodily Illness at that Time.

Was her bodily Illness connected with either of those Two Circumstances?

No; I should say not directly connected with either of those Two Circumstances. She appeared to me to have a great deal of bilious Affection, a disturbed State of the Stomach and Bowels; her Pulse was very high; she was in a Fever.

Not Puerperal?

No.

From the State in which she was, do you think she may be perfectly well so as to be free from all those disagreeable Circumstances at this Time?

No; I should say not. What her Powers of Constitution may be to recover I cannot say. I have not seen her since, nor had I seen her before that Moment. I thought her then exceedingly ill, and I did not expect her Recovery. She may have recovered her general Health, and the Laceration which has taken place may be skinned, but the Aperture of the Vagina must be much larger than natural. I am sure it must be so, granting it to be healed, which it may be; and that Enlargement of the Aperture may itself be attended with much Inconvenience. The Prolapsus Uteri which had then taken place, and which I understood had then taken place to a great Extent, she may in a great Degree recover from; but she may be deprived, I imagine, of the Means of supporting the Uterus in consequence of the Aperture of the Vagina being so large. I think there would be a Difficulty in introducing into the Vagina and retaining there any Means for supporting the Uterus. The Woman has sustained an Injury, at least suffered an Accident, that she cannot perfectly recover from; and that will be a Discomfort to her, more or less, during the rest of her Life.

Though the Wound may be skinned over?

Yes.

If anybody should say she is as perfectly well as ever she was, can that be true?

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

5

Certainly not. I should say it may be true with regard to her general Health; but if it is said that she is as well as she was before, and without any Consequences of the Accident, that cannot be.

Could a Person of the least Skill look at her and examine her without perceiving that there was that which you say might arise from a Case of Negligence?

Certainly not. I have no Doubt that if examined at this Time by any competent Person her State would be found to be that I have described.

You say she had prepared herself?

When I went into the Room the Woman was lying in Bed in a very miserable Hovel. She used a Sponge, or something of that Kind, for Decency sake.

There was no unpleasant Smell?

There was in some Degree. I do not know what the Amount of the Discharge might be. There was a Woman attending the Patient. The Discharge did not appear in considerable Quantity, and not remarkably offensive; but she had been sponged, and therefore was not offensive to the Extent she otherwise might have been.

When were you told this Injury took place?

I think some Months before.

You attended by the Desire of Mr. Ruddock?

Yes.

How long before had you received the Request from Mr. Ruddock?

I had received the Request from Mr. Ruddock, a Month or Two before, to desire I would visit some Patient at Stowey, but I shortly after received a Letter to say that the Patient was then supposed to be dying. I think it was said **845** it was said she was in a State of Coma, and she was thought to be dying, and that there was no Occasion for my going to Stowey. I heard no more of the Case until, on my Return from Sir Peregrine Ackland's, Mr. Ruddock stopped Mr. Toogood's Carriage, in which I was, and asked me to see the Woman then. I went to the House, and saw the State of the Woman, and heard what Treatment Mr. Ruddock had adopted, and approved of it. I thought his Treatment judicious and proper; and the Woman stated herself to be then getting better. That was all that passed upon the Subject.

Do you know whether before this she had been away from Stowey over the Quantock Hills?

No; I understood she had not been out of her Bed from the Time of her Confinement, or very little out of Bed from that Time.

Could you tell from her Appearance whether there had, at any Time, Mortification taken place in that Part?

I cannot tell; I dare say Portions may have sloughed, but there was no sloughing at the Time I saw her.

You cannot tell whether Mortification had begun, so that it was supposed that she would die in consequence of the Mortification?

I cannot say that.

Could it have taken place without there being something which would make you perceive that it had been so?

Certainly such a Circumstance might have taken place.

Would it be possible, supposing Mortification to have taken place, to stop it under those Circumstances?

Yes.

That would be Bark and Quinine and Port Wine, and such Remedies as those?.

Yes; most likely Tonics would be essential under such Circumstances.

Would not that, in case of Puerperal Fever, be a very strange Remedy to give?

Yes.

What would cure one Complaint would aggravate the other, would it not?

Diseases interlace each other in so extraordinary a Manner that, at certain Periods of a Disease, Tonics are essential to be given, when a few Hours before Tonics would be most highly injurious. I can hardly speak on so nice a Point.

The Probability is, that if Mortification had taken place, and the Woman was at the same Time labouring under Puerperal Fever, the Remedies given for Mortification would have been injurious for the Fever?

That would depend upon the State of the Fever.

Would Puerperal Fever be brought on by Laceration?

I do not know that Puerperal Fever would be brought on by Laceration; but if Puerperal Fever existed, and Laceration existed too, I should say that the State of the lacerated Parts would be affected by the general State of the Patient; it

would be worse than if the Laceration occurred to a Person not under Fever. Puerperal Fever attended with a sloughing Wound would then place a Patient in that State in which tonic Treatment would be consistent, and would be proper.

Where would be the sloughing brought on by Puerperal Fever; would it be in those Parts?

In a Person having a lacerated Vagina, if sloughing should take place, accompanied by Puerperal Fever, the Danger of the local Injury would be greatly increased by the constitutional Disease.

Would that Laceration bring on Puerperal Fever?

It might bring on Fever.

It would not be called Puerperal Fever, because it occurred in Childbed, by a skilful Man?

If it took the Character of Puerperal Fever it would.

846 *Would it necessarily take that Character?*

Not necessarily, but it might.

If it did not, it would not be properly called Puerperal Fever?

There might be verbal Distinctions; it would be merely a verbal Distinction if a Person after Childbirth received a severe Wound or a severe Shock to the Constitution of any kind which might give rise to Fever, to call that Fever Puerperal. The Term applies only to the Period; it is a Fever that occurs after Parturition, and therefore it has been termed Puerperal Fever. It marks its Connexion, but it has nothing to do with the Production of the Child, except as far as it relates to the Period.

It is a Fever consequent on Parturition?

Yes; often attendant on Parturition.

It does not mean any Fever arising from any particular Circumstance during Parturition, but is a Fever arising from any Circumstances when occurring in Parturition?

No, I should not say that; because it is involved and connected with the Functions of the Organs of Parturition; but I do not call the Perinæum a Part connected; it is only an accessory Part to the Organs of Parturition, not a primary Part.

Are there not some very particular Symptoms of Puerperal Fever, such as being highly infectious?

Yes; it extends through the Lying - in Hospitals where a Number of Women are together; it is infectious, certainly.

That is not the Case with Fevers in general?

No. A Puerperal Fever I have known happen

where it has not gone further, and have known it to happen to Persons as if depending on the Constitution, the Atmosphere, and Predisposition on the Part of the Patients. I do not know whether to call it absolutely infectious or not; it is generally considered so, but it is not invariably so.

Are you to be understood that such an Accident might occur without either Negligence or Want of Skill in the Midwife?

It might occur; but I have never known it to occur in Cases where Females have delivered themselves, and have had Children under Hay - ricks, and behind Hedges, and been left entirely to themselves. I have not known of such a Case occurring. I believe myself that it may be produced by officious and injudicious Meddling. I think that it is possible and probable; but it rarely happens, I believe, in a State of Nature, to any Extent, though I have known it in Quadrupeds.

Have you ever known it happen when the Patient has been in the Hands of the most skilful Practitioner?

I believe it might happen when no Skill could prevent it in a Case of spasmodic Action; but I think, at the same Time, that ignorant and officious Meddling might cause it.

Has it ever occurred to yourself?

I am not aware that it has; it may have happened in a very slight Degree, but not sufficiently to be complained of; but I can conceive that such a Case might occur. I recollect a Case to which I was called on a Trial, where a Gentleman was blamed because a Laceration had taken place; but it was proved that he was paying every proper Attention, but that the Patient suddenly started from her Bed, and Laceration took place. It was clear that he had not the Means of preventing that, and so the Case terminated in his full Acquittal.

The State in which this Woman was when you saw her does not necessarily imply either Negligence or Want of Skill?

Certainly not.

Is that the Case to which you have just alluded, of a Lady starting up, a Case Mr. Toogood alluded to?

It was a Case tried at Taunton Thirty Years ago.

Do you know where it occurred?

It occurred in Crewkhurne. I was in Court at the Time, and I was desired by one of the Barristers there to sit by him. I was not called as a Witness, but merely to give him any little

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

7

847 anatomical Information that might be required, and I heard the Case with great Attention. The Patient was a very irritable Female; the Surgeon was in the Room to assist her, and she suddenly sprang out of Bed. The Infant was born; and the Surgeon was prosecuted, I believe, from bad Feeling of the Family towards him. That was clearly shown at the Trial.

No Care could prevent that?

No; she started up, and the Child was born, and a very considerable Laceration of the Perinæum took place.

How long have you practised as a Midwife?

All my professional Life.

More than Twenty Years?

Yes; more than Thirty Years.

Has any other Case occurred to you in all your Practice?

No, there has not.

Do you know any other Instance of its having occurred to a Medical Man of Skill, except in the Case to which you have alluded?

No, I do not.

You did not refer to the present Case in your Answer?

No; I was asked as to my Practice. I only saw this Woman once, and that but for a short Time.

Was there any thing in the Nature of the Injury or the delicate State of the Woman's Health connected with those Injuries which led you to conclude positively that they arose from the Unskilfulness of the Midwife?

No; I should not have attributed the Case to the Unskilfulness of the Mid wife. At the Time I examined the Woman it was a long Time after her Parturition; if I had seen her just after I do not know that I could have said this was done by an ignorant and dangerous Interference. I do not know that I could take upon myself to say that in any Case, but still less after so long a Time; but I should say in every such Case due Attention to and Knowledge of the Functions of Nature at the Period of Parturition would give a much greater Degree of Probability that no such Accident would take place, than if a meddling and officious Person had been engaged; I should say that Care and Skill and Judgment would, in a Majority of Cases, though they could not always prevent, have a Tendency to prevent such an Accident taking place.

That is clear as a general Proposition; but have you any Means or Grounds of applying that general Proposition to this particular Case as to the Cause of this Injury?

No, I think not; I do not know any particular Ground in the Appearance or the State of the Woman that would induce me to say at once, this has been done by Violence or by unskilful Practice. I do not think there would be sufficient to say that; for in the Case at Crewkhurne the Laceration was immense, and it would have been very unjust for any Person to have drawn the Inference that that Person suffered from Want of Skill; it was clearly shown that she was not suffering from Want of Skill or proper previous Care, for the Woman was in Bed; but the lower Classes of Society are ill accommodated with Bed Clothes, and there is a Habit amongst the old Nurses who attend in Confinements of making them walk about previous to their Confinement, in order, probably, to save the soiling the Bed Clothes. They generally insist upon the Child being produced when they are standing; a Position most likely to cause the Evils complained of, and some other Evils which I will not go into. I should certainly in such Cases ask whether the Woman had been confined in Bed. If she had been brought to Bed walking about that would have a Tendency to produce such Laceration.

Do you happen to know whether this Woman Allen was confined in Bed?

I do not; I made no such Inquiry.

You stated that you had never known a Case of the Kind occur with Women who delivered themselves in Fields or under Hedges; would those be People who would be walking about during their Labour?

They generally, I believe, lie down. I do know an Instance where a Child was born of a Woman 848 shortly after quitting her Mistress's House. The Woman was standing in a Field, and the Child was produced at One Effort; and I think I showed on her Trial that the Child was killed by the Fall.

Do you happen to know the Practice of the French Obstetricians, Men Midwives?

I know their Theories; I do not know their Practice absolutely.

Do you not know that their Practice is to deliver Women in an upright Situation; not standing, but sitting?

I know with many French Surgeons, and I believe throughout the Mediterranean, that is the Custom, and perhaps in the South of France;

but Labours in the Mediterranean and the South of France are more easy than in this Country.

You hold that that would be a bad Practice in this Country?

I think so; I have seen great Evils arise from it.

Prolapsus Uteri is a very common Complaint, is it not?

Yes; it is a frequent Complaint.

There is a Return from the Truss Society that in Thirty Years there were 2, 418 Cases of Prolapsus Uteri, besides Prolapsus Vaginæ and Cases of Prolapsus Vesicæ; that would be at the Rate of Eighty per Annum; is that more than you would expect?

I dare say there may be that Number; I have not arrived at any thing like a statistical Calculation of the Number.

You say that the Woman was very ill in bodily Health when you saw her?

She was.

Did she say that she had been in that State for a considerable Time before her being brought to Bed?

No; I did not go into her State previous to her Confinement.

You did not know how far her previous State would require her being assisted by a skilful Person in her Delivery?

No.

Did you prescribe for her?

I certainly did not write for her; I think I did not write for her, because I approved of the Treatment Mr. Ruddock had adopted, which was very judicious, and the Woman stated she was better.

Was it internal or local Treatment?

It was internal Treatment; and a Lotion, I think, was used to the Organs.

After this Laceration had taken place could any opening Medicine have any Effect in curing it?

Certainly not. It would have so far an Effect in curing a Wound that if the Bowels are not taken care of, and the general Health attended to, no Wound will heal.

Was it not absolutely necessary that something more should be done?

Certainly.

You know what the Female Midwives in Somersetshire are : do you think that a Female Midwife would be competent to the taking care of this Woman after such an Accident had occurred?

Certainly not.

From your general Experience of the Midwives, are they fit, in case of Laceration such as you have described, to be trusted with the Care of a Patient?

Certainly not. I have had a great deal of Experience with Nurses, and I am sorry to say that I have never derived any Advantage or Information of any Kind whatever from any Midwife or any Nurse I ever knew in my Life; they are generally a very uninformed Class of Persons; their Notions are most unaccountable. How the Follies which have got into their Minds have been venerated there is beyond my Conception; but we have not till within a few Years been able to get rid of the Infant being bandaged from Head to Foot; they do it in Germany to this Hour; that has been a mischievous invention of that Tribe of 849 People; that, however, is got rid of in this Country. A Thousand Freaks and mischievous Plans they adopt; not one of them is of the least Use, and most of them highly injurious. The great Use of a Medical Man attending as an Accoucheur is to exclude the mischievous Meddling of Nurses. In my own Family I have never had what is called a Monthly Nurse. I have advised my Patients not to have Monthly Nurses; and I have never known One Lady, who has once been prevailed on to dispense with a Nurse, who would ever after employ another to attend her. Nature is so competent, that in Ninety - nine Cases out of a Hundred a scientific Man will do nothing.

Where there has been previous Illness, was it safe to leave the Woman to be delivered by One of those Women?

Certainly not.

That must depend upon the Nature of the Illness?

I think it is never safe to leave a Woman requiring medical Treatment to the Care of a Nurse. I never knew a Nurse to whom I would leave a Woman in such a State.

Supposing she had been attended previous to her Delivery by a Medical Man for a particular Complaint - Constipation of the Bowels, - and had been reported well Three Weeks before her Confinement, should you infer necessarily from that, that it was dangerous that she should be delivered without the Assistance of a Medical Man?

I should not have inferred that from the mere Fact of her having been before indisposed; it would depend upon the Degree to which she might have been relieved, and the State of Health in which she was.

You do not infer from that, that she ought to have had more than any other Person the Attendance of a Medical Man?

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

9

Not from the Statement that she had been ill and was then well.

Would it be desirable that the Medical Man who had attended her previously should be called upon to decide whether he should attend her in her Confinement?

Certainly, the Medical Man would be the only Person to judge on such a Point.

Do you know Mr. Ruddock?

I know him personally; I have met him Twice or Three Times.

Did you know from him that he had attended her previously?

No; I had hardly Time to get any previous History of the Case; I consulted upon her then State without reference to the past, except so far as it was necessary to enable me to know what her then State was.

Did you learn from him that he had been attending her some Time?

Yes.

And that he had recommended she should be attended by a Medical Man?

I think he told me so.

Judging from his Statement, and the State in which you saw her, have you any Doubt that she ought to have been attended by a Medical Man?

I have no Doubt that she ought if Mr. Ruddock had recommended it; I have no Doubt he would give a very satisfactory Reason why he should have attended her under those Circumstances.

Have you been called in to attend any other Patient under the Bridgwater Union?

No, I have not.

Hysteritis Simplex is an Inflammation of the Womb?

Yes.

I think so. If she was in bad Health, and any Medical Person stated she was in a Condition that would require scientific Assistance during 850 her Confinement, - I should say that a competent Surgeon making such an Assertion, if he could be believed, would be the only Person to judge of the Necessity, and that his Judgment should decide that Point,

You do not remember having attended any other Patient belonging to the Bridgwater Union?

I saw a Person with a dislocated Shoulder. Some Months ago a Person came to me with a dislocated Shoulder; a most obvious Dislocation.

The Moment I saw the Shoulder I asked when the Dislocation had happened; the Woman stated that it had happened some Months before; I think nearly Three Months. I asked who had attended her, but she could not tell me the Name of the Surgeon, but said it was some Surgeon at Bridgwater; that she had fallen from a Cart, and had bruised and lacerated her Elbow, (and there was a Scar on the Elbow,) and she had applied to this Person, who told her that her Elbow only was hurt; that he ordered her a Lotion, and was very attentive, and according to her Statement had attended her a Week at Bridgwater, and during that Time saw her Three or Four Times. She informed me that she told him that she knew there must be something wrong with the Bone, for it pressed against her Ribs; he said, No, it was only a bruised Elbow. On the following Saturday, when she left Bridgwater, having been under his Care then a full Week (from the previous Saturday), she returned to Taunton, and the Surgeon then supplied her with a Bottle of Lotion, and told her to apply that; that, depending upon his Opinion, she had asked no further Aid, but had suffered a great deal of Pain, and was unable to use her Arm. About a Week before she had seen me she had gone to the Taunton Hospital; there the Surgeons had told her her Shoulder was dislocated, and that they much feared it was too late to effect a Reduction.

Did you think so too?

No; I told her I would attempt it; and I did make an Extension to some considerable Degree, to which she very readily submitted; but I was unable to reduce the Bone at that Time; but I told her I would make further Attempts, if she chose to apply to me at some other Time. Two Days after she called again on me, and asked if I was ready to give my Opinion that the Shoulder was dislocated? I said, Certainly. She then asked me whether she ought not to have Compensation.

Had she been treated as if she had dislocated her Shoulder?

No. She told me she had told the Surgeon who had attended her, whose Name she did not know, that the Shoulder was not in its Place, and that he said it was. She said she had been advised by her Friends to prosecute the Surgeon, to obtain some Compensation. I said, " I can say nothing upon that Subject; I cannot advise you at all. " She then mentioned the Names of some Attorneys, — Two Attorneys. I said, " They are

very respectable Men; you must be decided by your own Opinion; I have nothing to say to this; you must take your own Course. "

In your Opinion the Surgeon had neglected his Duty?

If the Case be as the Woman states it, it is the most gross Case of unreduced Dislocation I ever saw in my Life.

What is the Name of the Woman?

I think it is Webber.

Did you know her before?

I did not.

Did you know any thing of her Character?

That she was a Woman of respectable Character.

Does she live at Taunton?

Yes; she lives near my House; she is a Washerwoman.

You knew nothing of her Case but what she stated to you?

I knew nothing of it but from her Statement. You know that it is a Case of Dislocation, and which had not been so treated?

It was a most obvious Case; and it appeared not to have been so treated, certainly.

851 *You do not know how it had been treated, except what the woman told you?*

No. The Case is at present, I believe, going on; I do not know that it is so; but I have heard since that she has applied to some Attorney, I think to Mr. Trenchard, and that a Prosecution is now pending, and that I must be called into Court to give my Evidence I have now given. The Name of the Gentleman who was accused by that Woman who called on me, I found, was Mr. Ward, who is the Surgeon of the Bridgwater Union. Shortly after he called on me twice. When he first called he told me that the Woman's Story was altogether a Calumny; that he had never seen the Woman in his Life, and knew nothing of the Case. I said to him, " Sir, I do not know you; but I can only say the Case is the most flagrant one I ever saw, and I am glad you have no Concern with it in any way. " He assured me that was the fact. Two Days after he called upon me again, and told me that he remembered the Case. I found he went from my House to the Woman; and he said, the Moment he saw the Woman he remembered her, and that the Woman had refused to allow him to make any Examination; that he had told her her Arm was dislocated, and she refused to allow him to make any Examination, or do any thing for her Relief. I said, " If that is the Case you are relieved from

Responsibility; you have only to prove that, and there is an End of the Case; the Woman denies that to be the Case. "

Has he made any Application to you to make it up with the Woman?

Yes, he did; he said, " I wish you would go and speak to the Woman, and try to make it up for me. " I said, " No, you will excuse me; I do not choose to interfere; I would not instigate the Woman to prosecute you, nor have I taken the smallest Step. " He said, " Yes, I have been told you have. " I said, " Then you have been misinformed. " The Woman spoke of employing an Attorney to me; and she mentioned Two most respectable Gentlemen, and I said, " You cannot apply to more respectable Men than those Gentlemen; " and I said to him, " I thought it might be doing you, or whoever it might be, a Service, for she might have found Attorneys who might carry on the Cause in a less proper Manner than those Gentlemen she had named would do. I told her that Mr. Trenchard, or Mr. Pinchard would do what was right. I could not recommend the Woman not to endeavour to obtain some Compensation, for I do think her Case, if she states it truly, requires it. "

All you know is from Mr. Ward and this Woman?

Yes.

Did you expect to be called as a Witness?

Yes; but I have heard nothing of it of late.

When did this Case occur?

Some Time ago.

Before the last Taunton Assizes?

Yes.

Do you know why the Case was not brought forward at the last Taunton Assizes?

I do not; I think I asked somebody whether it would be brought on, and was told there was not Time to bring it on at the last Assizes.

You have not mixed yourself up in the Case at all?

Not at all; I have endeavoured to keep myself free from it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

ELIZABETH WOOLLEY is called in, and examined as follows :

WHERE do you live?

At Stowey.

Were you present when Charlotte Allen was brought to Bed?

No

852 *When did you see her after she was brought to Bed?*

The next Morning

In what State was she? Did she complain of any thing particular?

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

11

Of nothing particular.
You went to the Relieving Officer?
On the Monday I did.
On what Day of the Week did you first see her?
On the Saturday.
What did you go to the Relieving Officer for?
For the Doctor.
How came you to go for the Doctor?
She sent for me, and begged me to speak for the Doctor.
Did she state any Reason why she wished to see the Doctor?
Yes; she told me she was very ill.
Did she tell you of any thing particular?
She told me what was the matter with her. I told her it was different from what it was with my Children.
Did she tell you there was a bearing down, or any thing of that Sort?
Yes.
Did you examine her yourself?
Yes.
Have you had any Children yourself?
I have had Seven. She asked me whether I could tell what it was. I said, " No, I did not know. "
She did not make you feel or examine her?
No.
You went to the Relieving Officer and found him in the Churchyard?
Yes.
What did you say to him?
I asked him if a Doctor would be allowed for Charlotte. He said, " A Doctor : for why? " I said, " She is very ill, Sir. " He asked what was the matter; I said, " I do not know; she is different from any thing I ever was with any of mine. "
What did he say?
He said if there was any Necessity for a Doctor he must be had. I said, I did not know whether it was the Case, or no, that there was no Parish Doctor fixed.
There had been a Dispute about the Payment to the Parish Doctor?
Yes.
Did he tell you to go to his Wife?
He said, " No; certainly, there is no Parish Doctor fixed; the doctoring is equally expensive now as if she was to pay for the Doctor herself; but she is not to lie and die for want of a Doctor."

Did he desire you to go to his Wife?
He said again, " I suppose you know what is the matter? " I said, " Sir, I do not think it proper to tell you; but if you think it proper to send Mistress she will convince you what is the matter. "
Did you go to the Wife?,
Yes. '
Did the Wife go with you to see her?
No. I went to Mrs. Waites, and she asked what was the Matter; I told her as well as I could. She asked what the Midwife had given her; I told her she had bathed her with warm Water and with Watercresses. She said, likely some little frivolous Thing might do equally as much Good as the Doctor, but she would be 853 advised by Kitty Walker; that was the Midwife. Then she said again, " I should. wish for Kitty Walker to be there. " " If I come up, " I said, " I will go and fetch her, if you will walk up. " Kitty Walker was Hay - making; she came in at Dinner Time; we told her what she said, and she went down and told her there was no Necessity for a Doctor, but a little Castor Oil; then Castor Oil was sent; Three Pennyworth.
Mrs. Waites went to see her?
No, not till the Wednesday after.
When she did come did she proceed to examine her?
I was not present when she came.
Did you see Charlotte Allen after you had been to Mrs. Waites on the Monday?
Yes.
You went back to her and told her what had passed between you and the Relieving Officer, Mr. Waites?
Yes.
What did she say?
She said she did not know what to do, for that she was very ill, and thought she should die.
Did she appear to you to be in a very bad State?
Very bad indeed.
Was she in great Pain?
Yes.
She complained of great Pain?
Yes.
When Mrs. Waites came down did she say she should order the Doctor?
Yes; the Doctor was ordered immediately after Mrs. Waites came.

How soon after that did you see Charlotte Allen again?

I did not see her till the next Day.

By that Time the Doctor had been there?

Yes.

Was he there the following Day too?

Yes.

Were you there when he was there the following Day?

No.

You do not know whether he examined her?

No; I only saw him go in and out.

How long did she remain in her Bed after her Lying - in?

She remained abed, I suppose, for Three Months.

She was confined to her Bed?

Yes. I cannot exactly say to a Week, but I believe about Three Months.

Do you know any thing of her getting up immediately after her being brought to Bed; the Day after she was brought to Bed?

Oh no; I do not know any thing of that.

What became of her after the Three Months; did she remain in Nether Stowey?

Yes.

She went some Time after that over the Quantock Hills?

That was Three Quarters of a Year after that.

In what Month did she go to that Place?

In March last; the latter End of March; she went a Fortnight before Lady Day.

854 *Did you see any thing of her between the Time of her being brought to Bed and her going to that Place?*

I saw her brought through the Street at the Time she was taken to the Union House.

Did you see her between the Time of her Confinement and the Time of her going over the Hills?

Several Times.

Did she continue ill?

Yes; she complained that she could not walk, and could not stand upright. *Did she complain of a Discharge?*

Yes, she did.

Was there any thing offensive in the Discharge; could you smell any thing?

No; I was not able to see any thing, any more than I heard her say.

Did she complain of the Discharge being offensive?

Yes.

Have you seen her lately?

I have not seen her since she went to go to the House.

Did you speak to her?

Yes; she came to me once, and Mr. Waites sent her some Tea and some Victuals to make use of.

Did she complain of being still inconvenienced by this Misfortune?

She still complained that she was weak, and not able to stand upright, and not able to walk.

Did she complain of still having that Discharge?

No.

You did not ask her, perhaps?

No.

You live near Charlotte Allen?

I live at the next House.

You were not present at her Delivery?

No; I left Four Hours before she was confined.

You saw her the next Day after her Delivery?

Yes.

When was she confined?

Not till late at Night.

Did Kitty Walker give her any thing?

She gave her some Senna.

Do you know whether that had operated?

I cannot tell.

Who sent you on the Monday to the Relieving Officer?

Kitty Walker.

Was Mrs. Date attending her at the Time?

Yes.

Did you not take back some Castor Oil upon the Monday?

No; Mr. Waites's Daughter brought it.

Was she more comfortable after that had taken effect?

No.

When did you see her after she had taken that?

She had taken it on the Monday Afternoon, about Four o'Clock, and I saw her the next Day.

She still complained?

Yes; she still got worse.

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

13

When you say she lay abed Three Months did you never see her up during those Three Months?

No.

855 *Did you perceive any disagreeable Smell when you went into the Room?*

I did not myself, but she did say herself that there was.

Did she go out at the End of Three Months?.

No.

Did she walk about?

No; she went along holding by Things, and sat by the Fire.

That continued up to the Time of her going away in the Cart?

She was taken ill after that, and confined to her Bed before she was taken away in the Cart.

Had you known this poor Woman before she was put to Bed?

Yes.

What had been her State of Health?

She had been ill for a long Time, but she had been very well for Two Years.

Do you remember what State she was in immediately before she was confined?

She was very poorly some Time before she was confined.

How many Days before?

A Week or Two.

Did she then express any Wish to have a Doctor?

She never said any thing particular; she said she must have whoever the Parish pleased to let her.

Did she express any wish to have a Doctor?

Not that I heard.

She was in bad Health then?

Yes.

Did she express a Wish to have a Woman rather than a Man?

No; she did not express a Wish either Way.

She did not express a Wish, in your Hearing, either Way?

No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MARY DATE is called in, and examined as follows :

WHERE do you live?

At Doriton.

Is that near Stowey?

About a Mile and a Quarter from Stowey. I have moved from Stowey.

You are the Sister of Kitty Walker?

Yes.

Did you live at Stowey at the Time Charlotte Allen was brought to Bed?

She lived in my House.

You attended her?

Yes, until her Mother came after she was confined; I assisted her between.

Had you any Conversation with her, before she was brought to Bed, with respect to having a Surgeon to attend her?

Yes.

What did she say?

She said she should like to have Kitty Walker.

That she should prefer having Kitty Walker?

Yes.

You are Kitty Walker's Sister?

Yes.

Did you attempt to persuade her to have Kitty Walker?

No, I never did.

856 *You are a married Woman yourself?*

Yes.

How many Children have you had?

I have had Five; I have Four living.

What State of Health was Charlotte Allen in before she was brought to Bed?

She was ill about a Fortnight or a little more before she was confined, and Mr. Ruddock attended her.

Did he attend her up to the Time of her being brought to Bed, or had he left off attending her?

Yes, and she got better, and came out after that.

Had she been unwell for some Time?

I do not know. She came to me in the April before her Child was born, and was ill about a Fortnight before her Confinement.

That Illness was a Complaint in her Bowels?

Yes.

That is not unusual in such Cases, is it?

She used to be troubled with a Complaint in her Side, Mr. King had attended her for a long Time before she came to my House.

Was that the Liver Complaint?

It was; Mr. King said it was the Liver Complaint.

When she was brought to Bed was her Labour a difficult one?

No.

How long was she ill?

From about a Quarter past Eleven in the Morning to Eleven in the Evening.

Twelve Hours?

Yes, Then we did not fetch the Midwife till about Two o'Clock.

Did the Midwife remain with her till she was delivered?

Yes; she never left her.

Did she complain, during the Delivery, of any particular Thing that was done to her by the Midwife?

No, not at all.

Was it a difficult Labour?

No more than that of other poor Women.

Did she walk about?

Yes, till the last Hour and a Half or Two Hours.

Was she delivered standing?

No; on the Bed.

She was delivered on her Bed?

Yes.

Did she require a good deal of Attendance from the Midwife, or was it a natural Birth?

A natural Birth; the same as myself and other Women I have been with.

After she had been brought to Bed did the Midwife leave her, or remain with her?

She remained with her a Couple of Hours or more.

That was the Friday Evening?

Yes. She did not stay all the Night.

You remained with her?

Yes; backwards and forwards; I did not remain in the Room all the Night. She appeared very comfortable.

She did not complain at all then?

No, not at all.

857 *Did she get up out of Bed the next Day?*

Yes; the Middle of the Day.

Are you certain of that?

I am. She said she could not make use of the Po in Bed. I said it was a dangerous Thing to a Woman in her Situation to get out of Bed as she did.

How long did she remain out of Bed?

Only a few Minutes.

After she had done that did she complain of any Pain or any thing extraordinary about her?

No, not the least.

When did she first complain of any thing wrong?

Between Eleven and Twelve o'Clock on the same Evening; the Saturday Evening.

What did she complain of at that Time?

She called me. I was in the next Room. I went to her; and she said there was something particular the matter; she did not know what; and she was in such a burning Heat she did not know what to do; but she said, " I suppose it is like you and other Women. As this is my first Child I am not used to such Things. " She talked a bit, and then she seemed a little better, and I left her again.

Did she complain of Pain?

Yes.

Pain in the Part?

Yes.

Was it in the Parts or in the Bowels?

In the Parts.

Did you examine her?

Not then. Her Baby was cross, and I took her Baby. I was suckling at the Time, and I took the Baby to suckle it; and I had not gone long before she called me again, and said to me, " Do go fetch Kitty Walker. " She said she was in a great deal of Pain. We fomented her Bowels with Flannel and warm Water, and she was better after that. She never complained again till the Monday Morning following; then she asked me to tell the next - door Neighbour to ask the Relieving Officer for something.

That was Elizabeth Woolley?

Yes.

Did she complain of bearing down before that?

She said she had something down before that.

Did you yourself examine her?

Yes, I did; on the Saturday Night.

Did you see any thing?

I saw something.

What was it?

It was very Red, but it was not very large.

There was something wrong?

There was.

Something unusual under those Circumstances?

Yes.

Did you tell your Sister, Kitty Walker, what you had seen?

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

15

Yes, but my Sister Kitty, I do not think, ever examined her.

Did you tell Kitty Walker what you had seen?

Yes.

858 *What did she say?*

She did not say any thing particular about it.

Did she say it was of no consequence?

She said she did not think it was of much consequence; she said she would warm some Water, and apply it.

Did she apply Watercresses to it?

I was not there at that Time.

After she had applied the Water, what did she propose to do about this Appearance that you say was uncommon; did she propose to take no Measure to remedy it?

No.

Did she think that the Pain arose from the Bowels?

Yes.

She said so?

We said so; she herself thought the same.

You imagined it was from the Bowels?

Yes.

You did not imagine it was that which you saw that gave her the Pain?

No.

In consequence of Elizabeth Woolley's going, some Castor Oil was sent?

No, not in consequence of her going; I went down myself for Medical Assistance the same Day.

To whom?

To Mr. Waites, the same Day, – that was the Monday, and told him that she was in a great deal of Pain, and that she wanted to have Medical Assistance. He said, " Yes, of course, Mary; if it is wanted, of course it shall be had; but I should like to see your Sister first; that is, Kitty Walker. " He saw her, and there was the Castor Oil, which operated in a Quarter of an Hour, and she felt better. She never mentioned the Medical Man after that till Wednesday.

Nor did she see the Medical Man after that till Wednesday?

No

Before that Castor Oil she had had some Senna Tea?

Yes, Twice on Sunday.

That had not operated?

No.

When she took the Castor Oil which operated, she was better?

Yes.

Did Kitty Walker see that Appearance you have referred to again?

Not till the Friday

Did not Kitty Walker and Mrs. Waites examine her on the Wednesday?

I was not in the Room; I cannot speak to that.

When Mr. Ruddock, the Medical Man, came were you present?

Yes : there were several in the Room; he told them to go out, and I went out.

Did he inquire of you about the Circumstances?

Not then.

Did he tell you, after he had seen her, what was the matter with her?

No, not in my Presence

He did not say any thing to you, or in your Presence?

No.

He came again the next Day?

Yes, Two or Three Times.

859 *He was with Mr. King then?*

Yes; Mr. King came with him then.

Were you present when they came?

Yes.

Did they send you out of the Room again?

No; I abode there. I will not be positively sure whether it was Mr. King or Mr. Ruddock put their Hand to put it back.

You saw that?

Yes; I saw him do it.

Did you see him examine her Person before that?

No.

You saw one of the Medical Men put his Hand to put this which had come down back?

Yes.

Did he say any thing what it was?

I will not be certain, but I think he said it was the Womb.

The Womb coming down?

Yes.

Did he speak of any other Injury, any thing else being the matter?

No.

He did not say she had been torn or lacerated?
Not then, but afterwards; that was the next Day.
Did he examine her the next Day again?
Yes.
Both of them together?
I will not be certain, but I think it was Mr. King the next Day.
Did he say he had found any thing else? :
He said she was torn.
You saw him examine her the first Time she was examined?
That was the Thursday Morning.
Was that done with Violence?
Yes; they laid her on her Back, and Two of us held her while he put it back; but he did not see it, he put his Hand.
Did he do that with Force?
Yes.
Was the Manner in which he did it violent; did she complain while he was doing it?
Yes; she cried out once or twice.
Had you ever seen the Thing done before?
No.
Therefore you do not know whether it was done with more Violence than was necessary?
No.
She remained confined to her Bed some Time after that?
Yes, for some Time.
Two or Three Months after that?
Yes.
Did she complain of Pain in those Parts after that?
No, not all the Time; from Time to Time she did.
Was there a Discharge from her?
Not much.
There was some?
In the Beginning.
860 *Was that offensive in Smell?*
No; I never smelled any particular Smell from first to last. I was there continually, from first to last.
Did not it discharge continually the whole Time?
No, for I washed for her after her Mother left. I showed her Changes to Betty Woolley, and there were no Stains.
When do you say that Discharge ceased?

I cannot positively say.
Had it ceased before Christmas?
Yes; a long while before Christmas.
You washed for her?
Yes; I washed for her after her Mother left her.
Did her Mother stay with her for some Time?
Yes; then she went home, and stopped for Three Weeks.
While she remained she washed for her?
Yes.
How long did her Mother stay with her?
She stayed with her Three Weeks, I suppose; she remained there after her Confinement, but went home and back again. She was there, I suppose, in and out for Eight Weeks.
Whenever she was there she washed for her?
Yes.
You washed for her in the Interval between her going and coming back again?
Yes.
During that Time you say there was no Appearance of Discharge?
Yes.
You judge from the Appearance of her Linen, not from actual Inspection?
Yes, from her Linen.
Did she complain of any Discharge during that Time?
Sometimes she did.
Did she complain of that up to the last Moment of her remaining with you?
No, not for a long Time before she left me.
Did she complain after Christmas?
No; I never heard a Complaint of any Discharge after Christmas.
Do you remember Mr. Standert coming to see her?
I remember a Gentleman coming to see her along with Mr. Ruddock, and he examined her.
That was after Christmas?
I did not see them, but she told me they had.
During the Three Months she stayed in Bed did she constantly lie in Bed, or did she get up?
She got up and sat on a Chair by the Bed Side.
Did she complain of Difficulty of walking?
No : she did not do as other Women would do, but sometimes she came down Stairs very well.

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

17

*During that Three Months did she come down
Stairs at all?*

Yes : she would come down and sit in the
Arm Chair for Three Hours together, and work
at her Needle.

She was not able to go about and to walk?

She did not do that; she went out of the
House once to the next - door Neighbour's.

862 *Did any body think she was in Danger?*

Mr. Ruddock and Mr. King did in the
beginning; in fact I did myself till I got a little
used to her; but as soon as I got used to her I did
not, for with the least Thing in the World she
would have the Hystericks.

Is Mr. Pope an old Gentleman?

No; he is not so very old.

Have you seen this Woman lately?

I have not seen her since she left my House, a
Fortnight before Lady Day.

You do not know what State she is in now?

No.

She was carried away in a Cart?

Yes.

Was she well at the Time she went?

No; only when they talked of putting her into
the House then she would be bad directly.

You mean into the Workhouse?

Yes. She would pin up the Bosom of her
Bedgown, and would say nothing. When Mr.
Buller came up to ask her to go in, and told her
that she would be better off there, then she
would pretend to be out of her Mind
immediately. She was sensible enough in a great
many Things at the Time.

*Did you ever hear the Doctor say, when he
attended her, that she ought to have a Medical Man
attend her?*

When Mr. King came to ask me several
Times, he said, " Mary, it is no Neglect of yours, nor your
Sister's; for if I or Mr. Ruddock had been present at the
Minute of Time, it might have happened the same. "

Was Kitty Walker present?

He told her so likewise, and the Woman who
is outside; and so I told Mr. Buller and Mr.
Everard Poole.

You are quite sure of that?

Yes, I am.

You remember you are upon your Oath?

Yes; and Salome Stacey was present too at the
Time.

*Did you ever hear Mr. Ruddock say before her
Confinement, either to her or to any body else, that
she was in that State of Health that she ought to have
a Medical Man attend her?*

No.

*Do you know whether he ever told Charlotte Allen
so?*

No, I do not.

*Did Charlotte Allen ever tell you that he had told
her so?*

No.

*You say that Charlotte Allen told you she would
rather have Kitty Walker than the Doctor; how came
that to be made a Question whether she should have
the Doctor or not?*

She asked me, when she was taken ill,
whether I would go to Mr. Waites; and I went
down. Mr. Waites was at Bridgwater at the
Board that Day, so I saw Mrs. Waites, and I
asked her; and she said it was ordered, she
believed, for Kitty Walker to attend her. I went
back and told her, and she sent for Kitty Walker;
and my Sister sent me back to ask who was to
pay her; Mrs. Waites said she was sure that
James would see her paid, that was Mr. Waites,
and I was to come down at Six o'Clock to let her
know how she was. When I told her this, she
said she was very glad of it, for she had rather
have a Woman than Medical Assistance.

*Did she say that Mr. Ruddock had suggested that
she should have a Doctor and not Kitty Walker?*

No; she never told me that.

863 *You were never told that yourself?*

Yes; I remember that when Mr. Ruddock
attended her Three Weeks before he asked her
who was going to confine her, and she said she
did not know; she must have whoever they
pleased to let her have.

*Did Mr. Ruddock make any Observation at that
Time that it was right a Man should attend her?*

No.

*Do you think you should have recollected that if it
had been said?*

Yes, I think I should.

*There has been a good deal of Talk about this Case,
has there not, at Stowey?*

Yes, there has.

*Do not you think if that had been said you should
have recollected it?*

I think so. He never said any thing to her
about that.

Do you practise as a Midwife?

No.

Does Mr. Pope live constantly at Stowey?

Yes.

How long has he lived there?

Eleven or Twelve Years, I suppose.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

SALOME STACEY is called in, and examined
as follows :

WHERE do you live?

At Stowey.

Do you know Charlotte Allen?

Yes.

Were you present when she was brought to Bed?

I was not.

How soon afterwards did you see her?

Not until the Thursday Night following;
nearly a Week after.

*Had she been visited by the Doctor in the
meantime?*

Not until the Wednesday Evening.

That was before you saw her?

Yes.

How came you to see her then?

I went up to see her, hearing that she was so
very ill.

Did you find her very ill?

I thought she was dying.

Was she in a Fever?

She was.

Did she complain of any thing else?

Yes; she was in great Pain.

Have you any Children yourself?

I have Seven.

*Did she complain of any thing particular in
consequence of her having been brought to Bed?*

She did not then; not till I sat up with her on
the following Night.

What did she complain of then?

Her Womb.

864 *Of its having come down?*

Yes.

What did she say to you about that?

I asked her whether she had any Objection to
my taking a Candle and seeing how it was, as I
applied the warm Water, by Order of the
Medical Assistant, every Five Minutes during
the Night, One Flannel at the Bowels and One at

her Womb; and I took the Candle and saw her
Womb in a different State from what it ought to
be. I took the warm Flannel into my Hand, and
asked her whether she would let me try to get
back what I saw; but I found that I could not do
it, and that she could not bear me to do it.

Had the Doctor before that examined her?

Yes.

*Had the Doctor told her what was the Matter with
her?*

I do not know.

Did he tell you?

Not then; he did afterwards.

When did he tell you?

He told me on the Sunday; I fetched him,
thinking she was dying.

*That was the Sunday Week after she was brought
to Bed?*

Yes.

Had she a good Breast of Milk?

She had.

Was she suckling the Child at the Time?

She could hardly bear for any one to put the
Child to her Breast; she was apprehensive of the
Child sucking her at all.

*Had you any Conversation with the Doctors after
they had examined her?*

Yes.

What did they tell you was the Matter with her?

He told me that the Womb was slipped out of its
Place; that was what he called the Mother; that
the Womb had come down.

Did he tell you any thing about her being torn?

On the Sunday I fetched him, and thought that
she was dying. He asked me particularly what
Pain she was in; and I told him I thought it was
an Inflammation had taken place. He said that
there had been a great deal of Fever in her, and
that what they were working upon was to keep
it off from her; and then he said it was the
Womb had come down out of its Place again,
and I should remain with him to assist him in
getting it up.

Did he tell you any thing about her being torn?

Yes; he told me that she was torn.

*Did he tell you whether there was any body to be
found Fault with?*

He did not then.

Did he say so at any Time?

He told me he thought that the Midwife
neglected it; that she had not treated it as she
ought to do.

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

19

When did he tell you that?
On the Sunday Evening.
Who told you that?
Mr. Ruddock; Mr. King was not at home.
She remained ill in her Bed there a good while?
She did.
Did you see her several Times?
I saw her Two or Three Times a Week, and I sat up with her Nights.
865 Did she continue to complain during all that Time?
Yes.
After she got up did she still complain of Weakness?
Yes; and not being able to stand upright, as if her Inside came out when she tried to stand up.
She remained in that State till she went over the Hills?
She did.
Have you seen her since?
I have not. I did not see her when she was brought in the Cart to be carried to Bridgwater Workhouse.
Did she complain of any Discharge inconvenient to her?
She was almost past complaining from what I saw myself.
Was there any Discharge?
Yes.
What Sort of Discharge?
A great deal of it was very Black and smelt very bad.
That was immediately after the Thing happened; when you first saw it?
That was nearly Ten Days after.
How long did that Discharge continue?
I do not know; because after the Waiters that sat up with her by Night were discharged I knew nothing more of it.
That was after the first Ten Days?
Yes.
Did you ever hear her complain of that Discharge continuing after that?
No; after the Parish would not allow of the Waiters any longer I knew nothing more of it.
How long did they allow them?
I believe it was nearly a Fortnight in and out; she was so ill they expected every Night to be her last.

In what State was she when they discharged the Waiters; was she equally bad?
Very; almost insensible.
Almost as bad as she had ever been?
Yes.
Did she complain of having those Waiters discharged, and say that she wished for their Assistance?
Her Mother continued with her then by Day and by Night.
She did the Duty that they used to do?
She did, according to her Constitution.
When you came to see her during the Three Months she remained in Bed, and before she went over the Hills, did you ever hear her complain of that Discharge from her Person?
She was always complaining on that Place what Pain she was in.
And the Discharge?
Yes; she was in a most dreadful State.
Are you sure she complained of the Discharge up to that Time?
No; I cannot say as to the Discharge; but I asked her where it was she felt Pain, and she said it was in the same Part.
You say the Discharge had a very filthy Smell; do you know any Smell that resembles it?
No, I do not.
866 Was it that her Stools came from her?
Yes; they did for some Time after, and her Water likewise. They came through together in the same Part?
Yes.
The Witness is directed to withdraw.
CATHERINE STANBURY is called in, and examined as follows :
WHERE do you live?
At Stowey.
Do you live near Mary Dates?
Yes; a very little Way from it.
Do you know Charlotte Allen?
Yes, very well.
Were you present when she was brought to Bed?
Yes; I was with her from Eight o'Clock till she was confined at Eleven.
Was it a good Labour, or was there any great Difficulty in it?
It was certainly not what any one may call a good Labour.

Have you had Children yourself?

I have had Five.

Did she complain of any thing particular during that Time, or was it the usual Complaint of a Woman bringing a Child into the World?

No; she did not complain of any thing, nor had I any Thought there was any thing amiss.

When did she complain first?

On the Saturday Morning; but I did not think then that the Complaint was other than was incident to every other Person.

What did she complain of on Saturday Morning?

She complained of very great Pain.

Did she ask you to examine her at all?

No; not till Monday.

Did she tell you what Sort of Pain she suffered?

She said she was in very great Pain, but she did not explain it.

Did she talk of a bearing down?

Yes; she said that was what her Pain was.

Was the Midwife there at the Time?

No, she was not.

Did she tell her what her Feelings were?

The Midwife had been with her several Times between Saturday and Sunday, and this was the Monday; and had made Applications, as I understood, but I did not see that.

When she complained on Saturday Morning, was that before she got out of Bed?

She had not got out of Bed at that Time.

You do not know of her having got out of Bed on Saturday?

No.

If she got out of Bed on Saturday, you do not know whether it was before she complained of this bearing down, or afterwards?

No; I do not know any thing of that.

On the Monday did the Doctor come to her?

No.

When did the Doctor come to her?

On the Wednesday; I do not know any thing of the Doctor seeing before that. She asked me 867 to see the State she was in; I begged her to let. Medical Person see her; and as far as I understood they went down and asked Mr. Waites, and he referred it to Mrs. Waites. Mrs. Waites inquired of the Midwife, as being the properest Person, and I understood the Midwife said there was nothing the matter with her.

What did she say when she desired to have the Doctor?

She thought it necessary; she did not understand her own Case properly.

Did you examine her that Morning?

I did.

On the Monday Morning?

Yes.

What did you find?

I found she was very much inflamed, and a very great bearing down.

Did you see any thing more than usual?

I found more than I had ever seen, and I have been in the habit of seeing Persons in that Way, and have had Children of my own.

Did you tell the Midwife what you had seen?

I did not see her till the Thursday Morning.

Did you tell her then?

Yes.

What did she say?

She seemed to make very light of it; she did not appear to me to understand it.

Did you tell the Doctor what you had seen?

No; they did not ask me any Questions. I do not think that at the Time they knew I had been with her in her Confinement.

Did you see her from Time to Time?

Yes. For some Time she remained in a dreadful bad Way.

Was there a Discharge from her?

Yes, and a very offensive Smell.

Did you always find that?

Yes; I always found it every Time I saw her.

Down to what Time?

I noticed it on the Monday.

How long after her being brought to Bed?

I should say for nearly Four Months. At some Times she was worse than other Times; it was impossible to abide in the Room.

How often in the Week did you visit her?

I have gone in when I have passed; Three or Four Times a Week. I considered her a Person that would never be able to do any thing for herself again.

At the End of Two or Three Months she got up and got into a Chair?

Yes; but she did not stay long; and then I saw her afterwards in a dreadful State.

What do you mean by a dreadful State?

She was very ill indeed, and it was from the same Cause, as far as I understood her.

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

Did she remain in the same State till she was removed to another Place?

I cannot say, for I did not see her for more than Two Months. I was attending a sick Friend, and did not know what was passing in the Neighbourhood.

Did she appear more satisfied when the Medical Man came to her?

Yes; but still she was for a long Time dreadfully ill.

868 *Have you seen her lately?*

No.

You have not seen her since she was removed?

No.

Did you ever hear her say that she wished for a Medical Man?

I did. She had been so ill for a great while before that I thought that Mr. King or Mr. Ruddock would attend her.

Was that before she was confined?

Yes.

What did she say?

Her Answer was that she would rather have had Mr. King or Mr. Ruddock, but that she must have whoever the Parish allowed her.

When you have had Children yourself, have you been always attended by Men or Women?

By Women.

Are you a Midwife yourself?

No.

You say the Labour was bad?

The Midwife herself said it was not exactly as it ought to be. Did the Woman herself interfere?

Yes.

Did she use any Force?

She must have used some from Circumstances.

What induces you to say she must have used some Force?

She must from Circumstances.

What are those Circumstances?

It is a curious Thing to explain; but by what I heard afterwards, and by what I saw, the Woman was not as she was before.

You do not know that she used Force, but you suppose she did from the State in which she was?

I will state another thing which confirmed me in my Idea : about Half an Hour before the Child was born the Woman screamed out, and said, “

Oh, Kitty, take away your Finger. ” I was not aware at the Time there was any thing amiss, but when I came to reflect on what I had seen and heard, I could not help thinking that that had to do with it. I believe I stated that to Mr. King as my Recollection at the Time.

Do you recollect any thing else that occurred in the Course of Delivery?

Yes : Kitty Walker said it would be a curious Labour; it was rather different from others. I have attended Labours before, but that was very bad. After the Woman cried out in that Manner she looked up at me, and said, “ Mrs. Stanbury, all will come together. ”

Who said that?

The Midwife. When I came to put all these Things together in my Mind they made me adopt the Opinion I express now.

Kitty Walker said it was a curious Labour?

Yes

But she never gave a Hint of sending for any Assistance?

No.

She was perfectly confident in her own Skill?

Yes. She did not understand it, or she must have acted very wrong.

Is Kitty Walker a Woman in the habit of attending Women in Labour?

She has since her Mother's Death.

How long is that?

The old Lady has been dead, I think, nearly Two Years.

869 *Was the Mother a Person in whom the People in general had Confidence?*

She was.

With respect to Kitty Walker, had the Women in general Confidence in her?

No; there were general Complaints.

Were there Complaints before that?

I had not heard them before, I never inquired, but I have heard since that.

You were present at this Labour during the whole Time?

Yes.

You say you infer that Kitty Walker used Violence because the Girl cried out; did you see her use Violence?

No, I could not; for she was at the Foot of the Bed, and I was up as it were in the Middle of the Bed.

And her Hand was under the Clothes?
Yes; I could not see any thing.
She cried " take your Finger away " ?
Yes.
*Have those Complaints been very numerous of
Kitty Walker's bad Management?*
Yes; I have heard many Complaints.
How many do you think?
I have heard of Two; and One Case was a
very serious Case indeed. I believe if Mr. King
had not been called in the Woman's Life would
have been sacrificed; the Child's was.
You never heard any Complaint before that Time?
No.
*Do you know the Names of any who have
complained?*
Yes; one of them is Mary Glover.
Who are the others?
The other was Jane Rich; those were Two
serious Cases; the others were not so serious.
Is Mary Glover living?
Yes; she is likely to be confined again.
Is the Child living?
No; dead.
How soon after its Birth did it die?
I think before it was born.
Is she alive?
Yes; but the Child was dead - born.
Charlotte Allen's Child is alive and well?
Yes.
She had a good deal of Fever upon her?
Yes; she was in a dreadful State when I was
called in.
Was she suckling her Child?
No, not then.
*Did you see her suckling the Child
afterwards?*
Yes. I do not think she was sensible of what
she was doing in putting the Child to the Breast;
their Motive for that was because of keeping the
Milk.
*Are you sure that the Child was never fed by
Hand?*
No; she suckled it, except at Intervals.
*It never got any Food except from the Mother's
Breast?*
I cannot answer for that.

870 *You do not know that it did?*
No.
Had she a good Breast of Milk?
Not always; sometimes it was better than at
other Times.
Was the Child healthy?
Not then; it is now.
Was it not a fine Child?
No; it was a very weakly small Child.
*You had known her before she was brought to
Bed?*
Yes; she was not a Person I was intimate
with, but I knew her from her being lodging in a
Person's House I was intimate with.
*How came you to be present when she was
brought to Bed?*
A Person that was to be with her was not
able, and requested me to go in.
You attended as a Nurse?
No.
*Did you know any thing of her State of Health
before?*
She had been very bad before that; but for the
last Two Years before her Confinement I did not
hear any Complaint.
Was she ill shortly before her Confinement?
Yes; not very unwell; but I considered only it
was the same with her as other Women.
You did not hear of any particular Complaint?
No; she had had the Influenza.
Who paid for Mary Glover and Jane Rich?
Themselves.
*Did Kitty Walker attend you in your
Confinement?*
No.
Did her Mother attend you?
Yes, for Three; my eldest was born in
London.
*Were there more than Two whom you have heard
complain as to Kitty Walker?*
Yes : but those I consider as serious
Complaints. But I have heard several say since
that they would not have her again; that they
had her once; that was what I meant by my
Answer.
What is your Husband?
He is dead.
What was he?
He was Postman to Stowey for Years.

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

23

Postmaster?

Yes.

Did he keep a Shop?

No, nothing but the Office.

Have you any Intention of practising as a Midwife yourself?

No. I have not; it is not what I should like to do

Are you any Relation of Mr. Stanbury the Clergyman?

No : I know his Name very well from having posted his Letters.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

SALOME STACEY is again called in, and further examined as follows :

HAVE you heard any Complaint of Kitty Walker in other Cases?

No, I have not; not that I could prove any thing.

871 *Have you ever heard Complaints?*

Yes; I cannot say but I have.

Before or since she attended Charlotte Allen?

Since.

Had you ever heard any before?

No.

What is the Name of the Woman respecting whom you heard Complaints?

Her Name is Mary Glover.

Any other?

They have talked, but then I cannot speak of it for a Truth, about Mrs. Rich — Jane Rich.

Were you attended by a Woman when you had Children yourself?

Yes; I had a Surgeon for some of my Children, but the last of my Children Kitty Walker confined me. I had my last Three Years and a Half ago.

Were you satisfied with her?

Yes, I was.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

ELIZABETH WOOLLEY is again called in, and further examined as follows :

HAVE you ever heard any Complaints of Kitty Walker in other Cases besides this of Charlotte Allen?

Yes.

Before she attended Charlotte Allen, or since?

Before and since.

Can you mention the Name of any particular Person?

Yes; there was Mary Glover since, that she injured a great deal.

Anybody else?

And Mrs. Rich; that was before.

Any other Case?

William Coles's Wife.

Was that before, or since?

It was before.

Had you heard any Complaints before?

Yes.

Did she ever attend you?

No; I was always afraid to venture.

Why were you afraid to venture?

Because I had never had her, and she was a young Midwife, and I did not like to have her.

Had you heard of those Complaints before?

Yes.

Were the Complaints pretty well known in Stowey?

Yes; and the last Child I was confined with, the Woman that always confined me was ill, and when I was very ill I did not know what to do, and I sent to Kitty Walker to beg that she would come, and she would not come, and she left me in the State I was in.

Who did attend you then?

We were obliged to do it between ourselves; I had no Midwife at all.

The Witness is directed to withdraw,

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

YOU stated the other Day that there were only Two Magistrates in Bridgwater; are you correct in that?

No; I stated that I did not recollect there were more than Two at that Time.

Are there not more than Two?

There is Mr. Allen and Mr. William Allen.

What is the Name of the Vicar?

Dr. Wollen; he is a Magistrate, but he is a very decrepid Man, and has not, I believe, attended the Sessions lately.

Does he act as a Magistrate?

I think not; but I do not know; he is a very decrepid Man.

Is he an old Man?

He has Children nearly as old as I am, and I am Fifty - three.

He must be between Seventy and Eighty?

Yes; he must be quite Eighty, I think,

Is he a Magistrate?

I know he was a Magistrate; I have never heard of his being otherwise.

Has he taken out his Dedimus under the new Commission?

I do not know.

Did you ever attend the Petty Sessions for any Purpose at Bridgwater?

I am not in the habit of doing so.

You do not know then whether he acts?

I have heard that he does not act; he is a Gentleman of considerable Age and is decrepid.

Does he do Duty in his Church?

He does not; he has a Son who sometimes does Duty, and another Curate. I rather think he has not done Duty for as many as Twelve or Fourteen Years, but I do not recollect exactly. I would take the Liberty of observing, that on correcting my Evidence I found that I was incorrect in stating that the Members of the Visiting Committee determined among themselves who should be the Visitor for the Week; it is, I find, determined by the Clerk of the Union, who sends a Circular Letter to the Members of the Visiting Committee, and then they act for each other if the Time appointed by the Clerk is not convenient to them; and I beg to put in the first Letter I received from the Clerk.

This Letter is addressed to me, and dated Bridgwater, 11th April 1837 : " Sir, I am requested to inform you that the following Weeks, commencing May 5th, June 2d, June 30th, July 28th, August 25th, September 29th, are the Weeks appointed for your visiting the Bridgwater Workhouse. I am, Sir, your obedient Servant, Robert Underdown, Clerk. "

Each of the Members of the Committee received a similar Letter?

Yes, I suppose so. Those were the Weeks that I was appointed to attend. Now, for some Reason that is unknown to me, before this 5th of May came I received another Letter from the Clerk. This is dated 25th April : " Sir, I am requested to inform you that the following Weeks, commencing June 9th, August 4th, and September 29th, are the Weeks appointed for your visiting the Bridgwater Workhouse. " Therefore, the first week that I was called upon to visit the Bridgwater Workhouse was June 9th; and I referred your Lordships to my Report in the Visitor's Book on July the 16th, which Day concluded my Week.

Have you any other Explanation which you wish to offer?

Your Lordships were making some Inquiry respecting the Expenditure for Malt, Cider, and Spirits in the old Workhouse, and asking whether I could furnish any thing like an Estimate of the Manner in which those Commodities were used. I have endeavoured to do that in the best Way I could. I find that on 873 that on an Average of Seven Years the average Expenditure was 48*l.* 14*s.* 2*d.* per Annum. If Thirty of the old Inmates and Persons doing the Work of the House were allowed One Pint of Table Beer per Day, Value $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.*, the annual Expense would be 34*l.* 4*s.* 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*; that would leave for the Governor, the Matron, and Family, and for all Cases of Illness where Wine or Spirits were ordered, the Sum of 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per Day, or 14*l.* 9*s.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per Annum; therefore, that Sum, which appeared in the gross to strike your Lordships as heavy, when it comes to be divided among Thirty Persons is only $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* a Day for each, leaving 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per Day for all Cases of Illness and the Governor's Family; but I do not mean to say that Thirty Persons always partook of it; the above is merely to be considered as an approximate Estimate of the Distribution.

Can you state the Name of the Labourer of Mr. Bouverie's who was ill?

Here is a Note I made at the Time : " Cannington. William Haymon works for Mr. Bouverie, 8*s.* a Week; no Liquor. Five Children; Twelve, Nine, Seven, Five and a Half, One and a Quarter Years. He had Four Loaves; Two Loaves ordered. "

What is the Date?

There is not a Date. I do not recollect to what Extent he was ill; but he seems to have been in the Receipt of Four Loaves a Week latterly. I did not volunteer this Case; I was asked whether I knew an Instance of a Wife coming for Relief who was told that her Husband ought to come, and I mentioned that Case for the Purpose of meeting that Question. I have nothing else to say upon it.

You see nothing to complain of in that Case?

I offer no Opinion on that.

You do not complain of it?

I conceive that every Gentleman should allow his Labourers sufficient to live upon without having Four Loaves from the Parish.

Is that below the usual Rate of Wages in that part of the Country?

It is not; the usual Wages are 7*s.*; but if this Woman is correct in stating that her Husband has 8*s.*, and no Liquor, it stands upon the same

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

25

Footing as the other Wages of the Country,
valuing the Liquor at 1s.

*Why should Mr. Bouverie pay his Labourers more
Wages than the common Wages of the Country?*

There is not the smallest Reason for his doing
so; but the Wages of the Country ought to be
advanced.

But Mr. Bouverie cannot do that alone, can he?

I made no Reflections upon Mr. Bouverie; I
was asked the Question whether I knew any
Case of a Woman being told that her Husband
must apply, and I mentioned this Case.

*But you brought forward this Case as a Proof that
Paupers were ill - used, and were not allowed to send
their Wives to make Application?*

I did not introduce it. I again say, I was asked
the Question whether I knew an Instance of that
Fact. I meant nothing more than this, that if a
Man was obliged to come himself to the Board
he would be certain of losing 1s. 2d. without
having the Certainty of getting any thing by it.

*Did you not state this as the Case of a Man being
unable to work, but not so ill as to be unable to come
to the Board?*

I believe that was the Case. I took no Note of
it at the Time any more than that rough Piece of
paper which I have put in.

*You gave up attending the Board, you say, after
the Month of July 1837?*

I did.

Why did you give up attending the Board?

Because I found that the whole Operation of
the Law, as administered in that Union, was
very bad, and the Conduct of the Board to the
Medical Men disgusting

874 *But you being a Guardian, would it not have
been better for you to try to correct that by attending
the Board?*

I did so as zealously and patiently as I could,
but I found instead of doing Good I did Harm. It
was known that I had written against the Law in
the Pamphlet addressed to the King. No
particular Clause or Provision of the Act was
impugned in that Pamphlet, but merely the
general Principles; still I found that I was an
Object of Suspicion at the Board, and therefore
considered that it was very better for me to be
absent.

*When you made a Motion at the Board did you
find much Support?*

I never made a Motion. I determined to take
my Seat at the Board and work at it sedulously,

but I never made a Motion.

Why did you not make a Motion?

Because I had written against the Principles
of the Law. If your Lordships should be of
opinion that my declining to do so was
improper I will not defend the Determination;
but I thought that it was the most proper Course
for me to take.

*If the Board were doing wrong would it not have
been your Duty to make a Motion?*

I think not. I expressed my Opinion when I
considered it right to do so. There was scarcely a
Day of meeting in which I did not offer some
short Suggestion.

*Supposing you had followed up your Suggestions
by a Motion, might not that have been attended with
Benefit?*

I believe that that is frequently considered
impolitic, even in elevated Assemblies. I believe
that if a Man were to persevere in pressing any
Question to a Division, with the Certainty that
he will be beaten upon it, he, by recording his
own Weakness, is likely to do Injury to the
Cause he takes up. If that is the Case in higher
Assemblies it is peculiarly the Case with
Farmers and Persons of less Education. For this
simple Reason, your Lordships would have no
Objection to confess that you were wiser To -
morrow than you are to To - day, if you saw a
good Reason to alter your Opinion; but there are
many Persons who, having voted on a Question,
will not vote otherwise.

*Does it not frequently happen that, though a
Person votes in the Minority for a considerable Time,
yet that persisting in his Object he at last gains a
Majority?*

Yes, certainly.

*Do not you think that it would have been as well
for you to have tried that Mode of proceeding?*

I have already stated that I do not think so.
Nothing would have induced me to leave the
Board if I had thought I could do any Good
there; I never flinched from my Duty while on
the Board.

*Did you go round the Wards when the Visiting
Guardians would not?*

Yes; but I do not think there is any thing in
that.

*When you made Suggestions were there not others
of the Board who supported you in those
Suggestions?*

Yes; I had a fair Measure of Support.

But you never tried how many of those there were who would support you in a Motion?

I never moved a Resolution. '

Did some of the Persons who were in the habit of supporting you make Motions?

They did.

When those Motions were made what Sort of Divisions were there; were they near?

They were not near; they were uniformly defeated, and generally defeated by Persons who took no Part in the Discussion, and no Part in the Business. There was a Number of Farmers from different Parts of the Country, seated in a Row, who rose up together, perhaps Eleven or Twelve, and who always voted with certain 875 certain Gentlemen, in whatever Way they voted. I remember sitting by One of those Gentlemen, who agreed with me in my View of the Case, and in every thing that was said on that Side; but when we came to the Vote I asked him whether he was going to vote for the Motion or the Amendment, and he said, " he did not know nothing about the Motion nor the Mendment, but that he should vote against the Doctors. "

You resigned your Seat at the Board because you did not think you could get the Board to agree with you in your Views?

I did not take my theoretical Views into the Board.

But you could not help taking those Opinions into the Board?

I mean that I determined that I would take no Advantage of my Situation at that Board to throw the smallest Difficulty in the Way of the Administration of the Law. I do not think it is fair for a Man to take a Seat at a public Board, and to use the Opportunities that he thereby has of throwing Impediments in the Way of the Administration of a Law, or the general Course of Business.

You would consider each Case according to its own Merits?

Yes; and according to the Law.

You have had a great deal of Experience in the practical Part of the old Law?

Yes; I have had a fair Measure of Experience.

Is not every Case in the Board of Guardians taken upon its own Merits and discussed upon its own Merits?

There are many Discussions entered into which are not connected with individual Relief. I should say that each Case is taken on its own Merits.

If it is taken on its own Merits, is it on what you consider to be its own Merits, or what the Guardians ought to do consistently with the Spirit of the Law?

I think that the great leading Principle at that Board was to save Money, to spare the Rate. I never heard but very little about the Relief of the Poor; the Matter was how the Rates were to be reduced; and what I complained of was that in that Union, where the Wages were very low, and where the Poor Rate was only 1s. 4d. in the Pound under the old Law, Two Things scarcely going together in any other Place, - in that Place, with low Rates and low Wages, they absolutely boasted of having reduced their Poor Rate Thirty - five per Cent.

In your Opinion was that lower than it could be reduced consistently with due Attention to the Wants of the Poor?

I deliberately state it as my Opinion, founded upon the Experience I have had, that the Poor Rate of that District ought not to have been reduced 6d. There were many Cases, no Doubt, of Imposition of Persons who ought to have been struck off from Relief, but there were many other Cases that ought to have been put on.

Do you think that those Cases which ought to have been struck off and those Cases which ought to have been put on have been struck off or put on with Judgment and Propriety?

Many Cases have been struck off which ought not to have been.

And those which have been put on, do you think they ought not to have been put on?

I think they all ought to have been put on, and a great many more. I could not adduce individual Cases; but where the Poor Rate and the Wages of the whole District were so low as they were in that District there is not Room for any thing like the same Reduction that you might, without perhaps producing Hardships, effect in another District.

And which may be very proper in that District?

Yes.

Do you think the Wages are sufficient to support a Man and his Family?

They are not; not in Comfort.

876 *If they get on with them, how do they get on?*

I do not know how a Man on 7s. a Week lives.

Do you think the Remedy for that State of Things should be a Payment out of the Poor Rates?

I think not; but until some other Remedy is provided the poor Man has nothing to provide for a rainy Day; he is actually brought down to

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

27

the Brink of Starvation; and if you stop that Source of Supply, though it may be a vicious one, without providing him with any other, you either drive him to dishonst Courses or you put him to Death.

Do you think the making up a Man's Income by Payments out of the Poor Rates is a likely Way to produce a general Increase of Wages?

That is a Question that I can hardly give a direct Answer to. When there is no other Way I think it would be extremely hard, if not unfair, upon the Poor Man to make him a Victim of a System which he is not at all interested in upholding.

Up to what Standard would you bring the Wages?

I cannot attempt to fix any Standard; it is absolutely impossible; the Labourer, like all other Persons, must take the Fluctuations of the Labour Market; but if you point to the Workhouse as a Place which the Labourer is to be put into if he cannot live upon 7s. a Week, and he objects to the Confinement, to the particularly low Diet, and the Chance of Disease, it may be very much better for the poor Man to endeavour to make 7s. a Week do than it would be to subject himself to such greater Punishment. But I confess it does not seem to me that the Labourer is the Party to be punished in such Cases.

That Evil is in consequence of the Wages being too low in that District?

It is.

Do you think that the giving Money out of the Poor Rates, to make up a certain Income to the Pauper, is the Way to increase the Wages?

It is the only way that I am aware of directly meeting an Exigency.

Has it not a direct Tendency, on the contrary, to keep the Wages low?

It would appear that it has so; but the poor Man only lives from Day to Day. There is no general Principle of Reasoning that will meet his Position; he either must be fed every Day, or he is lost; he is not in a Situation to be subjected to the individual Contingencies arising out of the practical Operation of general Principles.

Is there not a strong Feeling against the Workhouses amongst the Poor in that Country?

The best Proof of that is that very few able - bodied Men have applied for Admission into the Workhouse, except during the Depth of the past Winter.

There being a strong Feeling against the Workhouses, will not a Man take lower Wages rather than go into them?

I beg to say that I have a decided Opinion upon that Subject; that the Workhouse System, instead of being calculated to raise Wages, is calculated to lower Wages; the poor Man has Two Evils before him, and he takes the smaller.

Is not that calculated to make him eke out his Wages, to the great Suffering of himself and his Family?

It is so; but I feel it an extremely delicate Thing to give an Answer which would lower the Character of Persons whom I have known from my Childhood, Persons who have been subject to all kinds of Temptation, and who have had as a Body, as much Honesty as any other Class; but Men will not die from Hunger.

Have you known that any of those Persons who formerly conducted themselves with Propriety have been since guilty of small Thefts?

I do not know it.

Those able - bodied Men who, rather than go into the Workhouse, have contrived to live upon their 7s. a Week during the Winter, in what State are they and their Families now?

I cannot speak to Particulars from my own Knowledge; but I have inquired, of a Person 877 who kept a Pawnbroker's Shop, and he told me that he never knew so much Distress among the Poor; that their Bedding and Articles of Furniture were pawned, which they used to keep throughout the Winter. The Inhabitants of Bridgwater appointed a Committee to distribute Blankets among the Poor during the Winter, and we found them in a very wretched State indeed.

Has private Charity increased since those Regulations have been introduced by the Board?

I do not know. In Country Parishes private Charity will not meet a great deal of the existing Want, and in Towns it would scarcely meet it at all.

Has there been in Bridgwater, for instance, since the Establishment of the new Poor Law, any Increase of private Charity?

I do not think there has been; I could not speak positively upon that. In my humble Way I was called upon to subscribe just as frequently under the old Law.

Was not a Committee formed in consequence of the Distress then existing?

There are Committees appointed at Times during any particular Pressure, such as a heavy

Fall of Snow, or an unusually severe Winter, or the Season being more unhealthy than usual.

Do you observe, since the new Law, that there has been any Variation in the Rate of the Wages of Labour in your Union?

No, not any. I have asked Farmers in the Neighbourhood whether they are aware of any Advance in the Rate of Wages, and they have told me that they think there is an Advance in the Rate given for Piece Work, but that there is no Advance in the daily Wages.

There is no Diminution in the Rate of Wages?

They could not cut down 7s. a Week.

Have you heard of any Ebullition of popular Feeling in the Union?

No; the Union has been very peaceable. There is certainly a great deal of Discontent; and perhaps I shall not be out of place in observing, that though I have written upon this Subject I have endeavoured to write to those who could improve the Law, and not to those who have been Sufferers under it, and there fore I have written in a Style and Manner different from that which I should have used if I had been writing for the Poor.

Have not your Pamphlets been distributed very much in that Neighbourhood?

I think very little; they have been sold in London principally.

Did not you set up a Paper in Bridgwater?

I answered that Question some Time ago. Lord Radnor's Brother is likewise Part Proprietor of a Paper that is a Rival to one which I sometimes write in.

Did you not set up a Newspaper for the Purpose of canvassing the Question of the Poor Law?

Certainly not.

What was the Object?

When that Newspaper was established, I think in the Year 1831, the Object of the Establishers of that Newspaper was to assist in protecting your Lordships in the Possession of your Dignities and Estates. I undertook the Management of it. Seven or Eight Gentlemen of Bridgwater agreed with me to share the Expense. I made a Stipulation, that in addition to the whole of the Labour I should pay my full Quota of the Loss; I have done so, and I do not regret it even now.

How long did that Paper continue?

For Three Years; till we had improved the Politics of the Neighbourhood

Did it continue till the Time that the new Poor Law was introduced?

I really forget the Date.

Did you discuss the Poor Law in it?

Not at all.

878 *You said that Lord Radnor's Brother was a Proprietor of a Newspaper; what do they call it?*

They call it the Mud Cart in Somersetshire, But what is the Name that it gives itself?

I never saw more than a few Numbers; on those I saw that it calls itself " *The Somersetshire County Gazette.* "

Do you know that Mr. Bouverie is the Proprietor of it?

It was a Joint Stock Concern, and Mr. Bouverie's Name was advertised as One of the Subscribers. He might possibly have sold out.

The Rate of Wages in your District, you say, is not raised?

I have inquired of several Farmers Men, who are not in the smallest Degree likely to take an extravagant View of the Subject either one Way or the other, and they have told me that there was a more liberal Price given for Piece Work, but that the established Price of 7s. a Week was not altered.

Had you had an Opportunity of forming an Opinion of the Number of Labourers employed; is it not your Opinion that, though the Wages of Labour to each individual Labourer may not be increased, there are more Labourers now employed than there were?

I think not. In the First Paper which I put in I believe your Lordships will find, that the whole Number of Agricultural Labourers in the District does not surpass the Number that is necessary for the due Cultivation of the District, and I cannot go beyond that general Statement; I have not that minute Knowledge of the Agricultural Labourers which would justify my attempting to do so.

Do you conceive then that the Entirety of those up to that Number was employed previously to the new Poor Law?

I conceive so; there may have been a few idle Men in the Forty Parishes, but very few.

Is there more or less Piece Work done in the Union than there was before?

I cannot say. I have asked different Individuals, and I have obtained no satisfactory Answer. I hoped to have been able to lay before your Lordships some Information upon that Subject, but I have not obtained any satisfactory Answer.

You are not an Agriculturist yourself?

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

29

I am not.

You live in Bridgwater?

Yes.

Therefore any thing you say upon this Subject is not from your own Information?

The Answers I have given have been all qualified. I have stated that I have received the Information from Farmers.

You cannot, therefore, speak from your own Knowledge?

No, I cannot; but I was asked what I believed to be the Case, and I have offered my Belief as Belief merely.

You have said that there is a Horror among the poorer Classes of the Workhouse; do you think that that Horror is so great that it has prevented some from applying for Relief who required it?

I have not the smallest Doubt of it. When your Lordships come to that Part of the Question you will find ample Proof of it.

When you spoke of Mr. Bouverie's Labourer whose Wife came to the Board, you did not mean to say that the Chairman found fault with the Woman coming instead of her Husband, when the Husband could come and was, prevented by Illness from working for Mr. Bouverie?

I meant to say that the Chairman did find fault; but I do not recollect the particular Circumstances of the Case more than I stated them. I thought it a very hard Case, and it was that which impressed it upon my Mind; but I do not know the Particulars of the Case; I do not know William Haymon; I never saw him.

879 *You say there was a Workhouse at Bridgwater when you were Overseer of. the Poor?*

Yes.

There was also a Workhouse in Petherton, which is now in the Bridgwater Union?

There was no House in which work was done; they were Poorhouses, and there were Poorhouses in most of the Parishes.

For the Reception of the Poor?

For the Reception of the Poor. In some Places there were Three or Four or Five Cottages belonging to the Parish, in which old worn - out Persons were allowed to reside.

There was a Poorhouse at Petherton, in the same Way as at Bridgwater?

I never saw the Petherton Poorhouse, but it must have been a large Building, for there were from Sixty to Seventy Persons in it after it was taken for the Union.

What has become of the old Workhouse at Bridgwater?

The old Workhouse at Bridgwater is unoccupied. I am not aware whether the Overseers have applied for Permission to the Poor Law Commissioners to sell it, or not.

They have built a new Union Workhouse?

They have.

To which all the Paupers within the Union are sent?

Yes.

And the Petherton Workhouse is abolished?

Yes; it was abolished at the same Time or shortly before the Bridgwater Workhouse was abolished.

In the Letter of the 9th of September 1836 to the Chairman of the Bridgwater Board of Guardians you complain of the Manner in which this Workhouse is built?

Yes; I called their Attention to the Subject that the Sills of the Windows were nearly Six Feet high, so that the poor Persons who were confined could not look out of the Windows; and I considered that a wanton Sort of Hardship inflicted on the Poor.

That is the Fact that the poor People cannot look out without great Difficulty?

They cannot look out of the Day Rooms at all.

Can they look out of the Bedroom Windows?

Yes, I believe they can; but those are very high.

But from the Day Rooms they cannot look out?

They cannot.

Whereabouts is the Workhouse situated?

On the North Side of the Town, within the Bounds of the Borough, in a healthy Situation; perhaps a better could not be found.

Does it stand by itself?

On the West Side there is a Row of Houses running parallel, but on the other Three Sides it is open.

How far are those Houses from the Workhouse itself?

Speaking loosely, I should say about 150 Yards.

Are they near enough for the Paupers to have Communication by speaking with the People in the Houses?

Certainly not; because there is not only the Workhouse, but there is a Wall surrounding the

Premises, and a Space divided into different Courts. There could be no Reason for the Height of the Windows as connected with the Externals at all, because the Boundary Wall, the Fence Wall, was much too high to be looked over, under any Circumstances.

880 *Then, supposing the Windows had been cut down, the Paupers would not have been able to look out of the Yard?*

No; they could only look into their respective Yards. If your Lordship : refer to my Letter you will see that; and it is of that that I complain; that they were prevented from looking into the Yards.

Is that Height of Window necessary at all for the Security of the Workhouse and for preventing any Escape of the People confined in the Workhouse?

Certainly not.

What Reason can you imagine the Person who built the Workhouse had for making the Windows so high?

To make the Workhouse as irksome as possible.

Is it possible to give any other Reason?

It is not. But I would beg leave to observe that the Result of that Letter will afford the best Illustration of what I had to expect from my Efforts at the Board. I never received the Civility of an Answer to that Letter.

At what Time was this Letter written; was it written at the Time the Workhouse was building, or afterwards?

While the Workhouse was building, and at a Time when the Windows could have been lowered at a very trifling Expense; before any of the internal Part of the House was plastered.

Were you a Guardian at that Time?

I was not; it was the Year before I came into Office.

Was the Contract made?

Yes.

Did you ever speak to any of the Guardians privately upon the Subject?

I did.

Did any of those that you spoke to concur with you in Opinion upon this Matter?

Yes.

Did you ever ask them to make some Proposition to the Board to have these Windows altered?

My Letter was read at the Board, and I did press upon One of the Guardians to see if he could not get an Alteration.

What Answer did he give you?

He said he would try.

Do you know whether he did so?

He informed me what took place.

Who was this Person?

Mr. William Baker and Mr. Coulthurst; but Mr. Baker was the most active Man; the other knew very little about it. He said he would bring it before the Board; and he afterwards told me that he had done so, and that there was a Disposition to lower the Windows, but that it was considered that as the Poor Law Commissioners had approved of the Plan no Alteration could be made in the original Building without an Application to the Commissioners; and as there would be some Expense attached to that it was considered that such an Application would not be attended to.

Would not the Expense have been diminished by having the Windows lower?

The Expense would have been increased.

That you understood to be the Reason, that they did not like to apply to the Poor Law Commissioners because it would cost more Money?

That was the Reason.

Was your Object to enlarge the Window, or merely to make it come down nearer to the Ground?

I should have kept the same Height of Window, and brought it about Two Feet nearer to the Ground.

881 *When was it that you applied to Mr. Baker?*

At the same Time that I wrote the Letter to the Board.

What sized Rooms were those?

I cannot state the Size of the Rooms, for that is a Subject which requires so much of your Lordships Consideration that I had almost determined to propose, by Petition, that it should be referred to you.

In this Letter of yours you speak of those Rooms as being " gloomy Cells " ?

Yes; they are lower by Two Feet than they ought to be for the Accommodation of so many Persons.

How high are they?

I think Eight Feet Six, or Nine Feet.

Do you know that?

I say that I think. I should be prepared on a future Day with accurate Information upon that Subject.

There are several Persons together in what you call those " gloomy Cells " ?

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

31

Yes.

Do you know the Length and Width of them?

I do not; they are long narrow Rooms, and intended to accommodate the whole of the respective Classes of Paupers.

Have you been in them?

Frequently.

When you were in those Rooms was there any Feeling of Oppression from their being too small or too low?

I have never been in them since the Paupers have inhabited them but once.

Is it only from the Windows being the Height you speak of that you call them gloomy Cells, or is it from the Rooms themselves being too small for the Purpose?

From the Height and from the Dimensions being altogether insufficient for the Purpose.

You cannot state the Dimensions?

I am not prepared to state the Dimensions; but I shall be prepared to go into that Question at a short Notice.

Why do you call them " gloomy Cells " in this Letter, as that is giving them a Character which you should be quite sure of before you put it into Print?

If the Expression is considered too strong an one I am not disposed to defend it.

Does not the Height of the Windows make them gloomy?

To me nothing can appear more gloomy than a Room closed up from the external Sight.

Are they light?

The Light comes in from the Top of the Room instead of coming in where it ought do do.

Is the Effect of that to darken the Room or not?

Clearly there is not so much Light as there would be if the Windows were Two Feet longer, but the Rooms may be light.

You do not know whether there is Light enough to prevent them being gloomy in that respect?

There is Light enough.

Do you know the Size of the whole Building though you do not know the Size of each Room?

If I had had the smallest Idea of being questioned upon that Part of the Subject I would have ascertained it.

Have you taken any pains to ascertain what sized Building is allowed to contain a certain Number of Prisoners in the Gaols?

I have.

882 *Do you know the Number of Persons that this Workhouse is intended on contain?*

Yes; 300.

According to the Allowance made to Prisoners, is there the same Allowance of Room for Persons in this Workhouse as in the Prisons?

Not Half as much as in the Prisons.

In Prisons the Prisoners sleep in separate Cells?

Yes.

In the Workhouse the Paupers sleep several in a Room together?

Yes.

And therefore, of course, do not require as much Room?

They require as much Air, I presume.

Is it not possible in a Room with a great Number of Beds to have a great deal of Air notwithstanding?

If the Room is sufficiently large.

Would it, in your Opinion, be better for the Paupers if each of them had such a Cell as a Prisoner has in a Prison?

Certainly not.

Therefore you think it is better for them that they should sleep in Rooms together?

Provided those Rooms are sufficiently large for the Number of Person accommodated in them.

Can you say that they are not large enough?

On my Oath, they are not.

How do you know?

Because I am prepared with the Dimensions of the Bed Rooms. Here is a long Detail of Figures, containing the Number of the Bed Rooms, the Length, the Breadth, and the Height; but I have not taken the Dimensions of the Sitting Rooms. I have squared up the Contents, and I find that the One - pair Sleeping Apartments contain 39, 057 Cubic Feet; the Two - pair contain 28, 447; the Sleeping Apartments altogether contain 53, 504 Cubic Feet. This Workhouse is stated to be built for 300 Inmates.

That is the greatest Number that can by Possibility be put into the House at any Time?

I see no Bounds to the Science of cramming; they may put in Three Times as many, but that is the Number it was calculated for.

And that is a greater Number than the Average?

Perhaps your Lordships would allow me to say that the building of the Workhouses of the Kingdom generally was entered upon without

any nice Examination of the Number of Paupers that were likely to require Accommodation; but I can give the Results : The Workhouse is stated to be built for 300 Inmates; that gives 1781 Cubic Feet to each. The Space allowed in the Penitentiary is 700 Cubic Feet, and the Space that Sir Gilbert Blane gave before the Committee of the House of Commons on Hospitals was 700.

What is the greatest Number that has been in the Workhouse?

I cannot say.

Do you know what is the Average?

I had withdrawn from the Board before the Poor were put into that Workhouse : but I see from the Returns that are sent weekly to the Assistant missioner that there may be 220 or 230 or 240.

Have there ever been so many as 240?

I do not know.

You know that House was intended for 300?

I take that from the Specification.

883 *Do you know the greatest Number that has been put to sleep in any One Room?*

I do not. I know that those Dimensions are correct, and that that is the whole Space, and that the Workhouse was built to contain 300 Inmates.

Do you know the Room No. 1., which you call the Men's Bed Room?

I have been in it; I have been in all those Rooms.

How many Beds were there in it?

I was in it while it was in the course of building, but I have not been in it when there was a Bed in it.

Do you know that the Rooms are crowded?

The Rooms must be crowded from the whole Space being so small.

But in point of fact do you know whether that Bed Room is crowded or not?

I do not know whether any Person sleeps in No. 1.

Then how can you state that the Space is too small for the Number of Inmates if you do not know whether they are so crowded as to be unwholesome; if it is built for Five and only Three are in it, is that unwholesome?

No.

Does it not depend upon the Number of Persons sleeping in the Room?

The Question goes to a single Room, which I cannot answer; I can speak to all the Rooms in the House.

Can you speak to any One Room in the House, as to the actual Number sleeping in it?

No.

How then can you speak to the whole Room being crowded?

Only in this Way, I say that the whole House does not afford sufficient Space for the whole Number to be properly accommodated.

That is according to Dr. Blane's Opinion, and judging from the Space allowed in the Penitentiary?

Yes.

You say that in the Penitentiary, taking the whole Area of the Building, there are 700 Cubic Feet for every Individual in it?

No; I beg leave to say that the Dimensions of the Cells in the Penitentiary amount to Ten Feet Seven by Ten, which is equal to 700 Cubic Feet; but on a different Occasion that Evidence was given this Session of Parliament to a Committee which sat to inquire into the Cases of some Persons committed to the Penitentiary.

You mean that the Cell in which each Individual sleeps in the Penitentiary contains 700 Cubic Feet?

Yes.

Have you ever been in those Cells?

No.

Are you aware how far they would contain Two Beds if it were necessary?

They would certainly contain Two Beds; the Black Hole at Calcutta contained all that were thrust into it, but 123 of them died.

In point of fact is there no other Reason why they have separate Cells besides the Unwholesomeness of their being all together?

There are other Reasons; but I have before stated that Sir Gilbert Blane, in the Evidence given by him as to the Quantity of Space that was necessary for Respiration, did give 700 Feet.

Was it that it was necessary for Respiration, or that that was the Space requisite for a Person kept in Confinement?

For Respiration. What first called my Attention to the Subject was the Death of Persons in the old Bridgwater Workhouse by Diarrhæa; it was said that the House was too crowded, though there were not many more
884 Persons in the House than used to be on the old Plan; but upon considering the Subject I saw that that Space which Persons in Health could live in very comfortably would not at all do for Persons in a State of Disease, in Fever, Smallpox, or in Diarrhea, or any Disease of that Kind. I further made some Inquiries upon the

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

33

Subject; I had the old Bridgwater Workhouse measured; I measured it myself, and employed a Surveyor to measure it also.

Is there more or less Accommodation in the old than in the new Workhouse?

There is less Accommodation in the Sleeping Apartments in the new than in the old; but there was not sufficient in the old.

What is the Difference?

I cannot state the Difference. I will read the Question and Answer that was put to Sir Gilbert Blane : the Question is, " In Rooms properly ventilated, and where the Quantity of respirable Air allowed to each Person is 1, 440 Cubic Feet, " that was in the Manufactories, " do you think that Employment would be prejudicial to such Persons? " The Answer is, " There is ample Room for pure Air there. In a Hospital there are 700 Feet to a Patient, and we consider that a safe and proper Space, still more so if they are in Health and walk about. In a Hospital well ventilated we find 700 Cubic Feet a safe and proper Space for each Patient. "

That is for Persons not in good Health?

Yes.

Are there Hospital Rooms in all those Workhouses?

No.

Is there in the Bridgwater?

There are Two Rooms there that are called " the Infirmary. "

What Space have they in them?

I do not know. I have never been in those Rooms since they have occupied them.

Doctor Blane's Opinion goes to say that 700 Feet are necessary in a Hospital, but that a less Quantity will do where Persons are in good Health?

Yes.

Unless you know how many People there are actually sleeping in One of those Rooms, how do you know whether they have not a considerably larger Quantity of respirable Air than you spoke of, - 1781 Cubic Feet?

I speak of the Quantity that is necessary for the whole; and presuming the House is fully inhabited, that would be the whole Number; but of course if there was a smaller Number of Persons in it the Quantity of Air for each would be proportionably greater.

Do you suppose that the Workhouse was built for the largest Number that it was possible to conceive could ever be put into it, or for the average Number?

I think it ought to be built for the largest Number.

Do you imagine it was so?

If it was intended actually to accommodate 300 Persons at all Times, it was a very sad Blunder in the Architect.

That would not have to do with the Architect, because the Guardians would settle what the Space was to be, and direct him accordingly?

I beg Leave to say that that was not the Case; for in the First Report of the Poor Law Commissioners presented to Parliament they published Plans of Workhouses. Those Plans of Workhouses are altogether inadequate for the Accommodation of the Number of Persons that they are intended, according to their respective Specifications, to accommodate.

Have you ever been in any of the Workhouses, and do you know that they are too small?

No; but I ascertain the Fact from reading, from Calculation, and from having lived myself in small Places.

885 *If you do not know the Number of Persons that are in the Rooms how can you speak to that?*

I can only repeat the Answer that I have given; that if there happened to be fewer Persons in one Room than that Portion of the House was intended to accommodate, there must be a larger Number in another Room, and I take the Medium.

Do you know that 300 were ever in the Workhouse?

No.

Do you know that Inconvenience has arisen from the Rooms being crowded?

No, not of my own Knowledge. I have only been in the Workhouse once since it was finished.

It is a theoretical Opinion of your own?

No; your Lordships will find that there have been Diseases in the Bridgwater Workhouse which have been fatal to a great Extent, which Diseases did not exist out of the House; there must therefore have been some local Cause.

Do you in point of fact know how many Persons have ever slept in One of those Rooms?

No, I do not.

You know that it does not contain the Space that Men of Science are of Opinion is necessary for the Number of People which it is intended the Building shall contain?

If Dr. Arnott, or any of those Persons who have been in the habit of attending to these Subjects, were examined, they could produce a

Conviction upon your Lordships Minds, perhaps, which I cannot.

What Conviction could they produce?

That taking the Number of Persons at 220 or 230 there would not be healthy Accommodation for that Number of Persons in that House.

You are speaking now, therefore, of 230 and not of 300?

Your Lordships at first asked me the Number of Persons that the House was intended to accommodate, and then whether I knew the Number of Persons that were actually in it. I do not know the Number actually in it, but I know the Number that it was intended to accommodate.

But you do not know how many Persons have slept in those Rooms?

No.

Have you ever heard that the Medical Person who attended the Workhouse complained of the Size of the Rooms?

No; I do not conceive that he would do so.

Have you ever heard that he complained of the Dietary?

No, not at the new House.

Have you not heard that the Medical Man objected to Part of the Dietary?

Yes; in the Month of April 1837; it is within my own Knowledge that that was the Case the.

Have you ever heard that the Medical Person objected to the Size of the Rooms in which the Persons slept as being unwholesome?

There have been no Objections made to the Dietary within the new Work house within my Knowledge, but I have not attended the Poor.

Have you ever heard of any Objection on the Part of the Medical Officer to the Spaces allowed in the new Work house?

Your Lordships will find in the Affidavit of One of the Surgeons that he ascribes the Diarrhoea in the Bridgwater House to the Smallness of the Rooms, and to the House being too thickly peopled.

What House was that?

The old House; I know nothing of the new House.

You do not know that there has been any Complaint of the Paupers being too crowded in the new House?

No.

886. *You say that Dr. Blane stated that 700 Cubic Feet were necessary for the Respiration of One Individual in a Hospital; will not the Size of the Windows and the Thickness of the Walls make a great Alteration with respect to the Quantity of Space that must be allotted to One Individual?*

The Thickness of the Walls, as far as I know, has nothing to do with it; the Size of the Windows may, because one whole Side of the Room may be knocked out, and then the Individual would have the whole World to breathe in, instead of being confined to breathing in a small Room.

What was the greatest Number of Persons put together to sleep in One Room in the old Workhouse when you were Overseer?

I cannot tell.

Had you no Rule?

No; it was an ill - arranged old House; but there was more sleeping Room for each Individual in it than is in the new House, in proportion to the Number to be accommodated.

How many People in your Knowledge ever slept in One Room?

I cannot tell; I can speak of the Average in the whole House. The Clerk of the Union was Assistant Overseer, and he can state the Number of Beds in any particular Room; I cannot.

What was the greatest Number in the Poorhouse at any one Time?

I cannot tell the greatest Number; but in the Paper I gave in the last Time I was examined there was, with the annual Expenditure for Seven Years, the average Number in the House. In 1829 the average Number was Seventy - four; in 1830, Seventy - six; in 1831, Seventy - eight; in 1832, Eighty - six; in 1833, Eighty - three; in 1834, Seventy - eight; in 1835, Seventy - three. If Six Per. sons be deducted as the Number of the Governor's Family, the average Number of Pauper Inmates for those Seven Years would be rather more than Seventy two.

Do you know the greatest Number at any one Time? I do not. What was the average Number in the House after the Union was formed?

Upwards of Ninety - four.

During the Time of the raging of this Disease?

During the Time that the Diarrhæa was raging in the House there were Ninety - four in the House.

How many was the old Workhouse calculated to hold?

I never heard any Calculation made; indeed,

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

Day 9, 5 July 1838

Evidence of Hugh Chatley Standert, p839; Elizabeth Woolley, pp 851 & 871; Mary Date, p 855;
Salome Stacey, pp 863 & 870; Catherine Stanbury, p 866; John Bowen, p 872

Edited by Tony Woolrich, 25/04/2021

35

till the Question was raised respecting the
Dietary, I did not know the Dimensions of the
House myself.

*The People from Petherton are now sent to the
new House?*

They are.

*Did you ever take the Pains to inquire how many
had been in the House ever since it was built?*

No. I should have been prepared to have
ascertained that, but I understood that a Return
was moved for by Lord Radnor, which I thought
would give that Information.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

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