

1893.
NEW ZEALAND.

SEACLIFF ASYLUM.

(INQUIRY BY DR. MACGREGOR INTO COMPLAINTS MADE BY CERTAIN ATTENDANTS, WITH HIS REPORT THEREON.)

Return to an Order of the House of Representatives, dated 13th July, 1893.

Ordered, "That a Return be laid before this House, giving the whole of the evidence taken before Dr. MacGregor at the departmental inquiry which was held at Seacliff Lunatic Asylum about six or seven months ago."—(MR. D. PINKERTON.)

SIR,—

Inspector's Office, Wellington, 16th January, 1893.

According to your directions I made a careful and exhaustive inquiry into the complaints of attendants Arundel, Impey, and Clark, recently dismissed by Dr. King. I took all the evidence on oath, and wrote it all out myself, and had it signed by the witnesses. I lay all the documents before you.

There was a good deal of dissatisfaction on account of the fact that the meat, of which the quality was always good, was often underdone, according to the taste of the majority of the attendants. As soon as the doctor's attention was called to it, all cause of complaint was at once removed; and all the witnesses admit that he received their complaints in a fair spirit, and made immediate inquiry. Arundel magnified the grievance, and was constantly nursing dissatisfaction among the staff. I am satisfied he was the originator of the "round robin," but that he did his best by lies and other means to get the responsibility cast upon Impey and others. He denies having had anything to do with the drawing up of the document; but both Impey and Duncan swear that he took part in its preparation. He also denies having made statements to the doctor when he met him in the corridor; but there can be no doubt the doctor's statement is correct, as Arundel left the table for the purpose of making the complaint (Downes's evidence). There can be no doubt that nearly all the attendants, in signing the document demanding a retraction of certain words falsely alleged to have been used by the doctor, and only in the second place complaining of the cooking, which had been already rectified, thought they were merely showing that those who had spoken at the meeting were not the only grumblers about the cooking. The framers of the document, however, so devised it as to commit the attendants to statements which they never intended to make.

As to the charges against the doctor of having called the attendants liars, conspirators, and savages, the conclusion one must come to is that, except as to the last, "savages," the words were never used. It appears that at the meeting the doctor stated his reasons for thinking that the statements made by Impey and others were incorrect; and then, Buckley and others (Downes's evidence) asked the doctor "If he meant to call them liars?" This is the origin of this charge, and there is clear testimony that the doctor did not call any one a liar. There is no evidence that the doctor used the word "conspirators." He appears to have said something to the effect that the complaints were limited to a few; and the authors of the document used the word "conspirators" as a compendious way of expressing their version of the doctor's statement, and attributed to him the use of the word itself. As to the word "savages," the evidence shows that the doctor was amply justified in using it to describe such conduct. Though the complaints of the cooking were courteously received, and the matter rectified at once, yet the evidence is clear that Arundel made complaints that were quite groundless, and did so in an insolent way, about the fish, &c.

The action of Arundel and Impey in getting up the misleading document in such circumstances was such as could not be tolerated; and men capable of such conduct were clearly unfit for the positions they held. There was no other course open to the doctor but to dismiss them. As for Clark, his own evidence and written statement show that the doctor afforded him an opportunity of putting himself right, and that he declined to avail himself of it, and, consequently, the doctor had no alternative. The dismissal of all three was justifiable and necessary; and the evidence is conclusive that the doctor treats the attendants with every consideration.

I cannot conclude without saying that in all my experience I have never known of a more deliberate and skilful attempt to make mischief in a public institution on the basis of such a frivolous grievance.

The Hon. W. P. Reeves.

I have, &c.,

D. MACGREGOR, Inspector.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

SEACLIFF, FRIDAY, 30TH DECEMBER, 1892.

WALTER PERRY sworn, examined.

1. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am charge-attendant in B ward. I have been about three years in the asylum. I, Wilson, Watts, Sneeston, Miller (and Sheppard, but I am not sure), all signed a paper saying that the attendants were unanimous in complaining that the food was badly cooked.

2. *By Dr. King.*] I do not recollect that the paper wanted the Medical Superintendent to apologize. I did not sign this paper as soon as it was brought to me; I was pretty near the last. I had nothing to do with getting up the paper. I was not willing to sign. I did so reluctantly; but I was not threatened. I consulted Downes as soon as we heard it was being got up, and we agreed not to sign it. The paper was brought up at the dinner-table in the hall, and read out by Impey; and he asked us all to sign it. I gave way to Impey and Arundel when I saw the other attendants sign.

3. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] Were you told that if you did not sign something would be written on the back of the paper?—No, I was not told; but I heard it hinted about. A good many hesitated, but were told those who did not sign would be no men but a lot of turncoats. It was hinted that those who refused would get their names put on the back of the paper. Merely putting the names on would not hurt; it was the memorandum added, that we had all complained previously but would not now sign when asked.

4. Who brought the paper when you alternately signed?—It was lying on No. 3 table, and we were all standing round. There had been several meetings, but I never attended any of them, simply because I wished to keep out of it.

5. How many days were you wavering before you signed?—I think it must have been about two days from the first meeting till I signed the paper. I think only a few were there, and that was the reason the paper was got up. I do not know, and I never heard, whether any complaint was made to the doctor about the food before the agitation was commenced. Mr. Stewart's attention, I think, was called to the meat being underdone. The complaints about the meat did not refer to its quality but to its being underdone. The complaints were general. I think I spoke to Mr. Stewart myself. I do not now think this was the right way to approach Dr. King. I never thought so. I was never refused redress of any complaint I made to the doctor. I have always been treated with great consideration and kindness by Dr. King.

DECLARATION BY FOUR ATTENDANTS.

6. ANDREW MILLER, JOHN AITCHESON, ALEXANDER ANNAN, and ANDREW WILSON, being collectively sworn, said: We all signed this paper complaining of the food. We none of us heard the doctor use the expressions complained of. We never heard him call any one a liar. We have never been treated tyrannically, but always with great consideration.

JAMES MAY ARUNDEL, sworn, examined.

7. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] The food for a considerable time back has not been properly cooked. The meat was mostly underdone. Salt meat in that state is not palatable; but none of the meat was properly cooked. The vegetables were only half-cooked, as a rule, and very dirty—that is, containing slugs, worms, &c. Very often the porridge was undercooked and full of lumps. The bread is sometimes very good, and we sometimes have a month when it is almost uneatable. Various complaints have been made to Mr. Stewart by different attendants. I complained myself. Clarkson did so on several occasions. Perry drew Stewart's attention to the bad state of the food, also Downes. This lasted for some months. Mr. Stewart usually said, "I will see the doctor." Sometimes he would bring back a reply as if he had seen the doctor. Once a loaf, badly baked, had all the crust taken, and the rest left. I took it and showed it to Mr. Stewart, saying, "Look at that. Is that fit for human food?" He said, "Certainly not. I will lay it on the doctor's table, and speak to him about it." Another instance: Once, at breakfast, all the attendants' porridge was returned to the kitchen. Stewart was spoken to, I think, by Clarkson, and he said he had seen the doctor, and that the doctor had seen the matron, who said the porridge was beautifully cooked. Twenty-four attendants returned their porridge. This was about the time of the cook's return from her holidays. One evening, about five o'clock, before the paper was signed, I went into the hall when the tea-bell rang. I went up to the table. There was nothing on it but half a loaf. Downes had plenty in the cupboard. We used to help ourselves from there. Of course, there was tea, sugar, and milk besides. There was no butter. We had our allowance of butter.

8. *Dr. King:* The attendants prefer to get their butter and sugar by the week, and bread by the day.

9. *Witness continued:* I asked Perry, who is in charge of our ward (No. 2), if there was anything else for tea. He said, "No." I said, "I will go home to tea." With that, I went to my bedroom to wash and change my clothes. I was going out by the back-door, leading from the corridor into the yard, when I met Impey. He said, "Have you seen Mr. Stewart?" I said I had not. He then said the attendants had been talking about the food, and had requested him to see Mr. Stewart, and ask him to inform the doctor that the attendants wished to see him. I said, "I won't stay. I'll see how you got on in the morning." He went into No. 1 ward to look for Stewart. I was going to hang up my keys in the office, when I met the doctor. He asked if I had seen Stewart. I said, "No." I remarked that Impey was looking for Stewart, as the attendants

wished to see the doctor about the food. Impey then came to the door of No. 1 ward, and told the doctor the complaint of the attendants. I understood they delegated Impey to speak to the doctor about the food. Impey stated the complaint to the doctor. I was present.

10. *By Dr. King.*] I made no statement to you myself about the food before Impey came. I did afterwards.

11. Did you not say, before Impey came up, that you had not been able to take your food for the day, and that it was unfit for human consumption?—No, certainly not.

12. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] Did you say that after Impey came up?—I made a statement something to that effect. After Impey made the complaint, I said to the doctor, "I can corroborate all that he has told you, and, speaking for myself, I have had nothing to-day, and I am now going home to get something to eat." Some further talk took place among the three of us. The doctor asked how it was, if the food had been so bad, that we had not complained before. I replied that we had complained times without number, almost daily, for some months past, to Mr. Stewart. The doctor said, "It has not been reported to me." The doctor said he would then go into the hall to see for himself. He questioned several of the attendants at different tables. Then he addressed the body of attendants and said, "You appear to have some cause to complain, and the discontent seems general. I will do what I can for you." He then left, and I did also.

13. *By Dr. King.*] On this day, when things came to a climax, what were the specific defects at the three meals?—At breakfast porridge was scarcely cooked at all, and the corned beef was half raw.

14. You complained that the porridge was lumpy, but you made no complaint about the beef being uncooked?—I made no complaint, nor did I hear any one else do so.

15. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] At dinner there was some fish and very bad potatoes. There was plenty of bread, but no butter. Cannot say if there was any other vegetable. I did not eat any of the fish. I had on previous occasions, or tried to, at least. I know we have called Mr. Stewart's attention to the fish as not being properly cooked. I do not know that anything was said on this day. I did not examine the fish by tasting, only by looking at it. I remember trying the potatoes.

16. *By Dr. King.*] Originally you told me that when you went to the table, and saw some coarse-looking fish there—apparently either shark or whale, it was coarse enough for either—you went out of the room?—I remember making that statement, but not as you put it. I did not say, "I left the room without trying to make a meal." I have already explained what we had for tea. On that evening in the hall, I heard you ask what other complaints they had to make. I think you met us very fairly, and said you would do what you could for us.

17. Except Watts on three occasions having found a slug, &c., in the cabbage, did any other complain about this?—I think Buckley did. I am not quite sure whether I complained about the dirtiness of the vegetables. I think I did. I remember Buckley once said the brocoli would be more palatable if we had a little sauce with it. I said to Buckley, "I think it frivolous to say such a thing. It would be enough if we got it properly cooked, without sauce." I then went home. Next morning I took breakfast at home. Attendants Marr, Pullar, Clarkson, and others said things were not improved at all at breakfast. The porridge was stopped, as it was not on the diet scale. The doctor had seen fit to withdraw it.

Dr. King: Having made inquiries about the complaints, I thought it would be right for one day to let the attendants have the official diet scale, as laid down in the regulations, in order that they might realise the number of extras which they were allowed, porridge being among these. This was done for one day only, except that, I believe, porridge was not given next morning, owing to a misunderstanding. The attendants were informed in the evening of the reason why the diet had been modified for the day.

18. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] The doctor had also issued instructions to keep strictly to the scale in all matters of diet. We were to be allowed one gill of milk per day, instead of the pint we had been used to. This is only what the other attendants mentioned above told me. At dinner, Mr. Stewart said, "The doctor intends to keep you strictly to the scale, and not one iota will you get over the scale." That evening I was at home after the day's work, but was coming back and met Perry. He had been sent for me. He said there had been a meeting of attendants summoned by the doctor about the complaints, and he had sent him for me. I asked what had happened, and he said he did not know. I met Stewart, who told me to go into the reading-room, and the doctor would come soon. At the meeting something happened between the doctor and Impey. When the doctor saw me he questioned me. This was the occasion when I said to the doctor that the fish was coarse enough for shark or whale. The doctor agrees it was then these words were used. In the reading-room, at this meeting called by the doctor, Impey stated that sometimes we got the remains of joints served up, that were far superior to what we usually got.

19. *By Dr. King.*] It was I at that time called attention to this?—I admit that. The doctor said he had made inquiries and found that there was no foundation in the complaint about these joints. That it took a whole sheep, and they got the joints in rotation; that the clerk stated this was the case, and that he believed the clerk in preference to the attendants.

20. Can you recall the precise circumstances which led to my saying which I believed?—I cannot.

21. Can you recall my saying that, as the clerk's statement was definite, and as the attendants had made other complaints, which, to my own knowledge, were without proper foundation, in my opinion the clerk was right, or words to that effect?—Yes; I remember something like that.

22. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] After the doctor said he preferred to believe Linton, two or three, Buckley especially, got up in an excited manner and said, "At that rate, doctor, we are all liars." Impey said it was very unfair to treat us so—to take one man's word in preference to such a number. Tattersall spoke to the same effect. Dr. King replied that we were making a grave charge against the clerk, which not only implied neglect of duty, but made him out to be a liar and a thief. I understood Dr. King to use those words. Mr. Linton, replying to the doctor at the meeting,

acknowledged that he did not personally see the joints served out, but ordered it to be done. I then got up and said that it did not follow, from what we said, that Linton was either a liar or a thief, as the joints passed through several hands before reaching the attendants' table. The doctor then sent for the matron and the cook.

23. *By Dr. King.*] Can you recall my stating to the matron and cook, as a preliminary, that, as they had not been present at the meeting, it was fair to explain what had taken place? Mr. Linton said the carcasses were cut in rotation; attendants said they did not get them so. I said I was convinced the attendants believed what they said, and that I simply wished to get at the truth?—Dr. King said that. This was after a hot discussion.

24. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] Replying to questions from the doctor, the cook said that two good joints, a leg and a loin, went to the reading-room (private patient's ward) every day. This explained why joints did not come to us. We mostly get necks. The doctor admitted that he had been mistaken about this matter, and there and then told Linton he had neglected his duty; and directed that the meat should be properly distributed for the future. The doctor went on to say he had no sympathy with the complaints about the bad cooking, lectured us a little, and left the room. I remember Impey asking the doctor to take evidence on both sides, and not merely from his own officers. The doctor said he was satisfied that the majority were quite satisfied with the food, and that the trouble only arose from one or two, who did not represent the majority. Impey claimed that the attendants by their presence supported his statements. The doctor would not believe this. The talk between Impey and the doctor got heated, and then the doctor left. I presume he meant that I was one of the malcontents.

25. *Dr. King:* As the meeting was called by me, I said, in reply to Impey, that if men had grievances they must state them themselves, and I could not take silence for consent. Arundel said to me that a number of the men then present had grumbled, but shrank from standing up and saying so.

26. *Witness:* I believe the majority of the attendants requested Impey to represent their complaints to the doctor.

27. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] After the meeting I asked Stewart, "When should the lights be put out to-night? While we are all here we should like to talk the matter over." Stewart said: "Keep them burning till eleven." I did not stay more than a minute after Stewart had left. I went to bed. This meeting was on Thursday, and the paper was not got up till Monday. I heard before I had reached the meeting that the doctor had called the attendants conspirators, liars, and savages. I did not hear the doctor say so; but it caused a soreness among the attendants. The way the doctor had treated the complaint was constant matter of discussion. I am prepared to swear that Watts, Tattersall, and Impey told me the doctor had used these words of the attendants. They also told me the doctor had abused me pretty severely in the early part of the meeting. The doctor, they said, had stated that my statements were deliberate lies. They also told me he said the complaint was made with the avowed object of disparaging certain of his officers—meaning Linton, the matron, and the cook. This soreness led to the idea of laying the matter before the doctor properly. They—that is, Impey, who took the lead—the attendants in a body wanted to make a written complaint to show we were unanimous; and that it was unfair to charge us with being conspirators, liars, and savages, and asking him to withdraw those expressions.

28. *By Dr. King.*] Was there any mention of an apology?—That would amount to an apology.

29. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] We only wanted Dr. King to withdraw those expressions. Impey, I presume, drew out the paper. I did not see it till it was brought out for signature. At dinner-time on Monday this paper was produced by Impey. All gathered round him, and he read it out. They seemed to approve of it—that is, the majority of them said so. All in the hall signed it except Downes. He said, as his reason, that he did not want to lose his billet. Next day he went to Impey and asked to sign the document, and Impey would not allow him. He then spoke to me, and said Impey put a memorandum on the back which made him more conspicuous than if he had signed it. I got Impey and seven or eight others, at Downes's request, to let him sign, after a little trouble. Impey's reason was that it would look as if he were coerced. Impey then asked the doctor to call a meeting at which this paper could be laid before him. He did so, and the Hon. Mr. McLean was present, at the doctor's request, because Mr. Chapman, the official visitor, could not come, and Mr. McLean being an official visitor himself. We all met. Several of the attendants were called before Mr. McLean, separately.

30. *Dr. King* explained that Mr. McLean wished to see the charge-attendants before going to the meeting. He saw the three charge-attendants.

31. *Witness continued:* The doctor related what had happened up to that point. He spoke fairly, from his point of view. He then left the affair in Mr. McLean's hands.

32. *Dr. King:* I left because I did not wish further discussion, because I had had insolence at a previous meeting.

33. *Witness:* Impey rose and said to the doctor, "Surely you will stay and hear what we have to say. It concerns you and your attendants, and not Mr. McLean." Impey read the report of previous proceedings. I had no hand in it. The doctor refused to believe we were unanimous, and said the trouble arose from one or two, who did not represent the attendants. At this point Impey produced the statement signed by the attendants. The doctor refused to read it. He then withdrew, and left us in the hands of Mr. McLean, remarking that it was not a spontaneous unanimity, but under coercion.

34. *Dr. King:* With regard to the statement that I said that I refused to believe they were unanimous, and that the trouble rose from one or two: I deny it. What I did say was that I had evidence that there was not complete unanimity.

35. *Witness continued:* Mr. McLean read this paper, and tried to smooth things over. He said, "Dr. King is a high-spirited man, and what you want is equivalent to an apology, and that is too much to expect in the circumstances." He advised us to go about our work and think no

more about it. Next morning I received a note of dismissal from the service. I was very much surprised, and asked Dr. King what was his reasons. He said he thought it would be for the good of the institution that I should leave. Two hours after I got a note saying, "On account of insolence, a general spirit of insubordination, and unfitness for the position of an asylum attendant."

36. *By Dr. King.*] Regarding the question of insubordination, can you recall any cases in which you were insubordinate?—Once, when first I came, I refused to obey Stewart to go on duty on the night of an entertainment, believing I was not bound by my agreement, having made a special arrangement that I should have no ward duty except on alternate Sundays.

37. *Dr. King:* It is absolutely false that I made such an agreement. I said that Arundel's duties would be on the same basis as Newman's, as to his going on duty on Sundays. Newman was on duty that night.

38. *Witness continued:* I am not aware that I refused to go on duty on any Sunday. The first Sunday I was here, following my arrival on the 19th January, 1892, Stewart informed me on Saturday that I was off duty my first Sunday; and Struthers, night-attendant, about half-past six or seven o'clock, came to me in bed and said I must go on in No. 2 ward. He said Stewart told him. I rose and, going out, I met Stewart and Struthers coming again, or perhaps going round. Stewart said I should be on duty in No. 2 ward. I said, "You told me I was off duty to-day." He said, "So you are, after 10 a.m. That is the custom." I did not know it. On Monday I asked to see Dr. King about it, and he explained, and I never objected afterwards. I went on duty after leaving Mr. Stewart.

39. *By Dr. King.*] Can you recall that on the 26th March you were absent without permission, and failed to go your round, your night on duty?—I cannot recall it; but I may have been mending a pipe. I never wilfully neglected my duty. I never heard of its being reported. [Report shows the fact. On 4th April, night-report says: "Arundel refused to go the rounds; his night on duty."]

40. Can you recall being censured by me on several occasions for insubordination?—I cannot recall any.

41. Did you ever see cruelty inflicted on patients by attendants?—I have seen attendants handle them very roughly at times. I did not report this either to the head attendant or to you. I mentioned it to Adam, the assistant clerk, after my services were dispensed with. This was in conversation with Adam. I said I had been told that even then a man was laid up from injuries he had received. I could not be certain whom I heard say so.

42. Who were the men you had seen cruel to patients?—I said Perry was given to shoving them about and sometimes striking them: not to injure them; but it appeared cruel to me.

43. Have you been in the habit of complaining about things connected with the asylum in the workshops or elsewhere in the hearing of patients?—It is quite possible, but I have not been in the habit of doing so.

44. Have you ever used language, recently, in the hearing of a patient, that there was likely to be trouble in the asylum at an early date? I am speaking of a time prior to the date on which the attendants complained to me of the food?—I do not remember such a thing. I think I am sure I should remember it if it had happened.

45. I understand that after I left the meeting some attendants got up and proposed to drop the thing, as it had gone far enough?—Two did go.

46. Did you rise?—I took no part whatever.

47. Did Impey, your representative, press for an apology from me?—The attendants demanded that you should withdraw the words used.

MATTHEW IMPEY, sworn, examined.

48. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I was attendant in No. 2 ward, under Perry. At the request of the attendants, I wrote asking Dr King to call a meeting. At this meeting I read the statements which I hand in. Frequently the meat was much underdone, and several times it was sent back as uneatable—that is, within the nine months I was here. I have seen a joint sent back on three occasions. I cannot fix the times. Cauliflowers and potatoes were nearly always badly cooked, until quite recently, since the first complaint when the doctor was called in. It has been all right since then. The doctor said he would do his best to put it right, and did so. With the assistance of Arundel and Duncan, I drew up the petition for presentation to the doctor. I hand in the original petition. The object of the petition was to show that my original statement was correct. The doctor said the complaint originated with a small section of malcontents, who had not been long in the service. It was desired to show they were unanimous. I understood the doctor to say it was a conspiracy on the part of a few with the object of disparaging certain individuals. Next morning porridge was cut off, and Stewart said we were to be kept to diet scale. We were two mornings without porridge. I heard the doctor say this was not intended to continue. The doctor said that the views he expressed when leaving the hall were modified—that is, about the bad cooking. I do not remember hearing the doctor say he wished the newer attendants to see what extras they were actually getting; but in the morning we got no porridge, and the chops were not sufficient to give one each. I was deputed to complain to the doctor. I asked if they all agreed that I should do so. No one dissented, and I did it. I did this for all hands. Some of the attendants, four or five, had gone away, Arundel among them. As he was always complaining about the food, they thought he had gone to the doctor. They always looked to him to state grievances. I had, previous to this, taken no act or part in the matter. I also thought he had gone to the doctor. He had been gone so long that I thought he could not have gone after all. The rest asked, then, for some one to go, and then I volunteered. Previously I had always discountenanced everything of the kind, because whenever it became so bad that I could not put up with it I should go away; I did not like quarrels. The doctor did not show any anger at having the complaint made to him. At the first meeting of the attendants called by himself, the doctor

said that he had no hesitation in saying that the statements made to him before he came into the hall were deliberate lies. I got up and said this must apply to me, because I made the statements to him. He said it was Arundel who made the statements, before I saw him.

49. *By Dr. King.*] At the meeting asked for by you at the request of the attendants, did you hold out for a retraction by me of certain objectionable terms, said to be used in regard to the attendants?—I wanted you to withdraw your statements: (1) that I did not represent all the attendants; (2) when you said it was a conspiracy on the part of the few; (3) that we were liars; (4) that we behaved “like savages, and were savages, and as such you would have no hesitation or compunction is treating us as such.” I held out for an apology on those grounds.

50. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] When I showed the notice asking the doctor on behalf of the attendants, the only one who dissented of those I showed it to was Andrew Millar. He said the food had been rectified, and we should let it drop. I was not content to let it drop. It was the notice for this meeting that contained the demand for an apology, and to remove the stigma so unjustly thrust upon us. I hand in a statement by Maxwell after he left. He left to better himself. While the cook was away the doctor said we got food we were not entitled to. The attendants themselves said during this time their meals were more satisfactory, and they did not see why they should not be always as good. The doctor said, probably the assistant cook made things in a special way, which could not be maintained without prejudice to the rest of the establishment. The difference was not in the extras, but in the cooking.

51. *By Dr. King.*] I said at the first meeting that I intended to resign.

52. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] The reason I changed my mind was to get the doctor to dismiss me, that I might be able to prove my statements were true. I said at the meeting with Mr. McLean that I challenged the doctor to dismiss me for the action I had taken in this matter. I have never in a former situation taken an active part in a matter of this kind. The reason given for my dismissal was that “you have proved unsuitable for the position.” I think this unsatisfactory.

MATTHEW IMPEY, resworn and examined.

53. I wish to supplement my evidence. I wish to know the scope of this inquiry.

54. *Dr. MacGregor:* My object is to inquire as to whether Dr. King has acted unjustly or tyrannically in dismissing Arundel, Impey, and Clarke.

55. *By Dr. King.*] Regarding the petition, by whom was it drawn up?—By myself, Arundel, and Duncan. I am quite certain Arundel was present, and made suggestions at the drawing-up of that paper.

56. Are the attendants who signed, in your opinion, responsible for the whole of this paper?—I may say they are not, in my opinion.

57. For what are they responsible? Is it only for the latter half?—More than that.

58. From what point to what point do you hold them responsible?—After thinking over it, I think they are responsible for the whole of it. [A few minutes were required to enable Mr. Impey to decide this.] I read the whole of the document to all the attendants dining in the hall. Arundel then took the paper into the mess-room and, I believe, read it to them who were there. I did not obtain the signature of Alexander Annan.

59. Of John Haig?—Yes.

60. Of John Pullar?—Yes. Pullar read the whole himself. John Clarkson was in the hall. The paper was signed without any pressure directly. Adam Russell said it was perfectly true, and very mild, and that no man need hesitate to sign it.

61. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] How could several of these attendants testify to the truth of the statements attributed to the doctor, at a meeting at which they were not present?—I told them what had happened. I believe what I saw was substantiated by those who had been present.

62. At which meeting were the offensive expressions—I mean those contained in the petition—used?—They all took place at the first meeting; some of them were re-stated at the second.

63. Which were re-stated?—One was that the complaint was concocted to disparage certain individuals.

64. Was that said before or after Buckley spoke?—I cannot say.

65. On how many tables had the butter been entirely exhausted on the evening of the first complaint?—It was on No. 2. I cannot say of the others.

66. Did it happen once a week that you had nothing but bread and butter for tea?—I could not say.

67. Do you believe it happened as often as that?—Yes, but frequently there were joints on the table on which there was not enough meat to go round, and some had nothing but bread and butter; for this they were heavy on the butter, and it ran out sooner. The butter ran out usually on No. 2 about Wednesday. We get out supplies on Friday.

68. Was it ever done as early as Tuesday?—No.

69. Did you rarely have any butter on Thursday?—That was so, on No. 2 table.

70. There was no butter on half the Thursday?—It was done even oftener than that.

71. Was it two out of three Thursdays?—It was four out of five Thursdays that the butter of No. 2 became finished. Four out of five times we had none left for Thursday evening. Sometimes individuals got some from the other tables. We were heavier on the butter than the other tables. It is a fair average that the butter only lasted four or five days. This applies only to No. 2 table.

72. Did you realise this when you composed the petition?—I did not realise it. I did not mean to convey what was not true, although I have inadvertently done so. I wish to give some particulars I formerly omitted. I believe Dr. King put me into the yard to do more disagreeable work, for the leading part I took in this matter.

73. *Dr. King:* It was not so. I had ordered Stewart to remove Miller from the yard, without reference to Impey at all. Stewart asked who should replace him, and it was decided to send Impey. It was no degradation to go into the yard.

74. *Witness* : Buckley, Clarke, and myself received quite different treatment for our respective shares in this business. Dr. King spoke to Buckley, so Buckley told me, and said his part was manly and straightforward.

75. *Dr. King* : Perfectly true ; so it was. Attendant Buckley expressed regret for his share in the matter to me in this office.

76. *Witness* : The doctor also said the asylum crockery had been maliciously broken by the attendants.

77. *Dr. King* : I cannot recall having made any such remark. Is a large dish "crockery" ? And if it is broken intentionally can you approve the action ?

78. *Witness* : No. [*To Dr. MacGregor* :] Ought Dr. King for one man's action to blame the whole staff ?

79. *Dr. MacGregor* : No.

80. *Dr. King* : The breaking of the dish was not the action of one, but of a number.

81. *Dr. MacGregor* : Did Dr. King attempt to influence Downes not to sign the petition ?

82. *Witness* : Certainly not.

83. *Dr. King* : The morning after the complaint, having been spoken to by the matron about the returning of the marmalade, and understanding that this was taken back to the kitchen by Downes, I sent for him to the office, and asked whether he thought it unfit for use. He said, "Certainly not," that he had taken it back because it was urged upon him as his duty as charge-attendant. As to promising him promotion, or suggesting anything of the kind, I absolutely deny it. Moreover, he being charge attendant already, the suggestion is absurd. I spoke to Downes before the meetings began.

84. *Witness* : Yes, but Downes knew a paper was being got up. The doctor says the signatures do not prove unanimity.

85. *Dr. King* : Certainly.

86. *Witness* : He said at the meeting he had proof we were not unanimous about the food.

87. *Dr. King* : Certainly.

88. *Witness* : And that these signatures were obtained under coercion.

89. *Dr. King* : That appears in evidence.

90. *Witness* : What are the names of those who were coerced ?

91. *Dr. King* : My answer is that the question needs no other reply than that this appears in evidence.

92. *Witness* : By whom was coercion used ?

Dr. King : I decline to answer. [*To Witness* :] Is it a form of coercion to threaten to write men's names on the back of a paper if they refuse to sign the face of it ?

Witness : No. I did write the name of an attendant on the back. That is my memorandum. I did this without threatening, for the reason of proving unanimity. I heard Downes say it made him more conspicuous to appear on the back. He came and begged to be allowed to sign. I do not think he would have done this except for the memorandum. I do not think this is coercion. I wish to swear that the evidence given by Arundel as to what took place, both from hearsay and from his own knowledge, at the meetings to be fairly correct, with the following exceptions : When Arundel says he did not see the paper till it was brought forward by me for signature, he is making a misstatement. It was not the fact. He said at Mr. McLean's meeting two attendants said the thing ought to drop, as it had gone far enough. Mr. McLean put it to the vote, and only four held up their hands for doing so. Their names were — I cannot tell the names, but I counted the hands and called out the number. Marr did not hold up his hand, but later expressed the wish, at the same meeting, that it should drop. At the second meeting, on Thursday, Dr. King said that the matron, the clerks, and Mr. Stewart had precisely the same food as we got ; but he afterwards admitted that they had extras, but that was no reason why we should get them.

93. *Dr. King* : It was alleged that custards went up to the clerks' room. I said it did not follow, even if that were the case, that custards should be given to the whole of the attendants. As a matter of fact one of the clerks is an invalid. [*To Witness* :] Do you think custards should form part of the attendants' diet ?

94. *Witness* : If I say Yes, I cannot tell you why ; if I say No, I cannot tell you why. [*To Dr. King* :] Is it a fact that at Mr. Stewart's table they always get pudding ?

95. *Dr. King* : It may be so.

96. *Witness* [*to Dr. MacGregor* :] What, then, did Dr. King mean by saying we got precisely the same food, without any extras whatever ?

97. *Dr. King* : I never said so ; it is false.

98. *Witness* : The statement was made at the second meeting on Thursday, and to attendant Buckley. [*Witness* desired to state how he had been treated since he got notice, both by Dr. King and Mr. Stewart.] Faults have been found where they did not exist. On Saturday, the 4th December, at the bathing, Mr. Stewart asked if patient Hughes had been bathed. Downes said he had been bathed in the ward. Stewart said, "Give him clean clothes, because these are dirty." Downes and I examined the clothes, and they were quite clean, and put on that morning. [*To Dr. King* :] Why was this last ball given to the attendants ? Is it not given for their past services and extra duties, connected with patients' dances, &c. ?

99. *Dr. King* : It is given in a liberal spirit ; certainly not as a *quid pro quo* solely. No attendant who has left is entitled to come to such a ball, unless specially invited.

100. *Witness* : Am I entitled, while an attendant, to the same privileges as other attendants ?

101. *Dr. King* : Yes ; but you could not expect tickets to a ball to come off after you left.

102. *Witness* [*to Dr. King* :] Stewart reported me to Downes, charge-attendant, as being quarter of an hour late coming on duty. Was it a fact ?

103. *Dr. King* : It was not.

104. *Witness* : When I received my day, referred to on paper marked "X," I wish to say that, if I had asked Mr. Stewart, I think I should have got leave ; that I intended to apologise and make up for it next day.

105. *Dr. King* : I left the matter till the afternoon to give him a chance of explaining. He did not do so. The leave would not have been granted, and he had no reason to expect it. It is always done formally in writing. At least, when I am present at the Asylum, my consent is always required. I frequently have to refuse such leave to deserving men.

106. *Witness* : Mr. Stewart was absent, and that is why I made no explanation. I never thought of the doctor in the matter ; and the first intimation I had of Mr. Stewart's return was his coming and saying the doctor wanted me in the office. I wish to admit I did wrong. The night of the ball I was not well, and went to bed. I went to Clark's room, and was ordered to get up. Stewart said that the doctor had ordered me to be turned out.

107. *Dr. King* : My order was not a specific order referring to Mr. Impey. I assumed that others were refused.

108. *Mr. Stewart*, recalled, said : Some others—for instance, some friends of the carpenters—were refused. Mr. Impey never asked leave to stay. Incraci, senr., was refused.

109. *Mr. Impey* : I went to bed without asking leave. I passed both the doctor and Mr. Stewart when I went in at No. 1 door going to bed. I did not know any better.

JOHN CLARK sworn, examined.

110. *By Dr. MacGregor*. I am a plumber-attendant. What brought the paper about was a statement by the doctor that the complaints before him by the speakers at the meeting called by him did not express the opinions of the staff as a whole, unanimously, and that they were grossly exaggerated. The object was to show that the staff were unanimous in their complaints. This paper was voluntarily signed by the staff. There was no pressure used in my presence. I could not say if any were pressed to sign. I did not try to influence any one. I required no pressure. I got notice of dismissal on the 29th November, the morning after the last meeting. Dr. King told me the same morning that if I expressed regret for signing the paper he would overlook the matter. The doctor gave no reason for giving me this chance and not the others. I refused his offer. The main ground of complaint was that the food was badly cooked. Sometimes the food would be very good, and sometimes very bad. Complaints were made to Mr. Stewart for a fortnight before, nearly every day. I complained myself. I think we had reason to complain of the quality as well as the cooking, for on several occasions there has been a shoulder of mutton on each of the four tables. The complaint was that we got the shoulder too often. I never saw any reason for saying it was not good mutton. Complaints were also made about the cooking of the potatoes. It was very bad. The proof is that since then the cooking has been very much better. Dr. King remarked in his statement that, if the food was bad, it was very singular that nearly every new attendant put on a stone in the first month or six weeks. I got up and told him that, speaking for myself, I did not think it was the nutritious qualities of the badly-cooked food, but more the change from town, and the bracing atmosphere. I was told that I was very insolent, and grossly insubordinate, when I dared to say such a thing.

111. *Dr. King* : Everything depends on the manner in which a thing is said.

112. JOHN CLARK [re-examined at his own request on the 31st December, said :] I hand in a memorandum of my interview with Dr. King, in which he offered to reinstate me if I expressed regret for my action in signing the paper.

113. *Dr. King* : It was the manner of Clark in making his speech at the meeting, and not simply the words used, that I thought insolent and insubordinate. [To witness :] You were one of the men who wished to call a meeting about the food, and Mr. Impey acted as your agent?—Yes, and I was present at the meeting.

114. *Dr. King* : You heard Impey repeatedly press for a retractation and apology?—Yes. I certainly thought there were grounds for that. The words I wished withdrawn were "malcontents," as applied to speakers at the meeting ; also the word "savages," applied to attendants ; also, the word "liars," once at least applied to the attendants. Some of the attendants at Mr. McLean's meeting got up and said, in an off-hand way, that the thing ought not to go any further. I was not willing to let it drop. I still think those words ought to be withdrawn. I asked for the reason of my dismissal, and I was told, in writing, that it was because I was unsuitable for the position.

ROBERT STEWART, sworn, examined.

115. *By Dr. MacGregor*.] I am head attendant. Within the last four months my attention has been called three or four times to the meat, as being undercooked. I did not consider the meat unfit to eat. Some people like their meat in the condition this meat was in. But on occasion the mutton was fairly cooked, but was blueish. It did not smell, and was quite fresh. Once the vegetables were badly cooked, and the attendants wanted sauce with them. I have sometimes spoken to the matron about these complaints. When the leg of mutton was brought by Blackclaws, and when the vegetables were hard, I spoke to the doctor. The doctor came in, saw the leg of mutton, and sent for the matron and cook. They could not agree whether the meat was undercooked or not. I found Arundel several times—I remember distinctly three times—insubordinate. Once, when I spoke to him about doing duty on a patients' dance-night, he treated me with contempt. He smiled sarcastically, turned away his head, and never spoke. I reported it verbally to the doctor, and he spoke to him. I was present on both occasions when the doctor reprimanded him. The doctor said if he could not drop into the rules of the asylum he had better go. He made a sort of apology and promised amendment. One time was on a Sunday morning. This was shortly after he came. It is not true I told him he would be "off on Sunday (to-morrow)." I asked the night-charge where Arundel was, and he was in bed. It is distinctly false that I ever

said he would not be on duty next day (Sunday). The usual Sunday holiday is from 10 to 10. There was no possible excuse for his being in bed this Sunday morning. His foreman, Newman, was doing duty on Sunday morning. No attendant is ever off duty on Sunday mornings except with the doctor's permission for ill-health, &c. Arundel was a growler from the very first. I was surprised the doctor did not dismiss him for insolence when I spoke to him on the patient's dance-night.

CHARLOTTE MATILDA BESWICK, sworn, examined.

116. *By Dr. Macgregor.*] I am matron. Once I saw the meat so much underdone that it was not fit to eat. It was a joint of mutton sent in by mistake. It was taken out of the oven to keep it for next day, and it was taken by mistake. The only reason I can give for the discontent is that some people like their meat what I call overdone. The cook is a very careful and good cook.

STANLEY BLACKLAWS, sworn, examined.

117. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I remember once taking a leg of mutton to Mr. Stewart, which was badly cooked. It was quite good and fresh. The Doctor sent for the matron. I heard no explanation of why it was underdone. The cook mentioned to me that it was the matron's joint.

118. *Dr. King:* The explanation was not given before Blacklaws.

Witness continued: About throwing out the fish: I got a large dish of fish. When I got to No. 1 table there were five attendants at that table, and four others standing round. I told them there were only four fish. I said they must stand off. They did not do so, but I was rushed. Some dishes were knocked down. I picked the fish up, and said: "If you don't go, I will throw them out of the window." My tea was spilled over my legs, and I knocked or threw the dish of fish out of the window.

JOHN MARR, sworn, examined.

119. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am head carpenter. When the first complaint was made, the doctor rectified the matter at once. I have never seen anything to complain of since. I felt sore at my accidental cutting of the tablecloth being called a "savage act." When called upon to clear the rest, I came forward and admitted I had done it. I cut the cloth in cutting a piece of cheese, because I had no plate.

120. *Dr. King:* It was a new cloth. It contained three cuts right through, each about three inches long. I could not imagine it was done accidentally. I classed it with the other act of vandalism—namely, throwing out the fish.

121. *Witness continued:* I also agreed to sign because I heard that the doctor blamed two or three for the complaint about the cooking.

122. *By Dr. King.*] I have always found you very just and considerate. I never found you severe.

JOHN KILGOUR, sworn, examined.

123. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an outdoor attendant. I could not say the cooking was often bad. It has not been worse lately than it has been off and on the last thirteen years. The bread some while ago was sticky; I think it must have been the flour. It was never unfit to eat; it was simply not up to the average. I have sometimes seen the attendants take the crust off good bread simply because it was rather new. The bread as a rule is good. During the month before the complaint the bread was good. There was nothing to complain of. When the first complaint was made I heard the doctor say he would do his best to put things right. There was nothing to complain of since that. I was quite taken aback when the doctor was called in. It began from one table—No. 2, centre table. The staff were not in it at all. It was said that the paper was not to be used, but simply to take it off the shoulders of Impey and Arundel, and, as we all had been making remarks, I signed it. The object was to shield Impey and Arundel from being the only agitators. I knew they were the men who had got it up. Nobody told me. I saw it with my own eyes. They did it without being authorised by the body of attendants. I did not know it demanded an apology from the doctor. I said, "It's all humbug." I was called a turntail and a crawler.

JOHN PULLAR, sworn, examined.

124. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am at present in charge of the farm. The meat was sometimes rather underdone. I like the meat very well done. The potatoes were waterlogged. I know you cannot get good potatoes at that time of the year. The new potatoes will not be ready for some days yet. The corned beef was pretty often rather underdone. I took no particular notice. I did not complain of the corned beef to Stewart; I cannot say whether any others did. I signed the petition to the doctor. The object of the petition was to let the doctor know they were not satisfied with the cooking. The quality of the meat was good. I am a butcher. The beef and mutton were good. I did not know this petition demanded that the doctor should withdraw some words he was said to have used.

125. *By Dr. King.*] They read a part to me, and they said it was to show they were unanimous.

126. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I merely signed to show the doctor there was something wrong. I did not go to any of the meetings; I did not think it worth while. There was nothing in it altogether. I would be surprised if it were shown to me that it [the paper] demanded the withdrawal of certain words the doctor was said to have used. The doctor at the first time said he would do his best to put the matter right. He went off to the kitchen. Immediately after that the food was first-class. The doctor put the whole thing right after the first complaint. I have heard the most of them admit this.

127. Why did you, after this, think it necessary to sign the paper?—It was because the doctor was said to blame only two or three. It was Arundel that told me, and also Clark, that the doctor blamed two or three. I thought, after they got their point, they were carrying things with a high hand, and that it was ridiculous.

128. *By Dr. King.*] You have always treated me very well indeed.

129. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I have never seen Dr. King treat any one with want of consideration.

130. *By Dr. King.*] I have always been treated with great kindness in lots of ways.

JOHN CLARKSON, sworn, examined.

131. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am charge attendant in No. 3. The vegetables on odd occasions were under-cooked. The beef was always well cooked—that is, the fresh roast beef. The corned beef was sometimes underdone. We get corned beef three times a week. Once only can I speak of it definitely, and then it was returned to the kitchen. I do not remember any complaints about its being undercooked the day the complaint was made. At breakfast that morning no complaints were made. There was some growling about the fish at dinner. It was proper, and well cooked, for I ate it. Arundel grumbled. He said he never did like that fish. At No. 2 table there was no butter. They had eaten their butter. Usually at tea we had cold meat. Thursdays we generally got a hot stew. On this night there was none. It very rarely happened that we only had bread and butter. There was usually cold meat. Impey fetched in the paper for signature. I said I would sign if the majority did. I heard Impey read it. Its object, I understood, was to show that he was not the sole originator of the disturbance.

132. Had you any ground for supposing that Dr. King thought Impey was the sole originator?—I was not at the second meeting. I depended on hearsay. I did not understand there was anything in it about retracting any words the doctor had used. It was intended to present this paper. I did not hear anything about withdrawing it. I heard Impey's report of what had happened at the first meeting. I did not hear the doctor use the term "liar." I heard him say that rushing Blacklaws for the fish was "a savage act." I did not hear him call them "conspirators."

EDWARD HENRY DOWNES, sworn, examined.

133. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am charge-attendant in No. 1 ward. I am aware that a paper was sent in to Dr. King complaining about the meat and potatoes not being properly cooked. I paid little attention to what was in the paper, so I cannot say much about what was in it. I heard afterwards there was something in it about the doctor making an apology.

134. What for?—I could not say. I think it was for something they said the doctor had said at a meeting.

135. What was it?—It was about not believing what the attendants had said. This was at the first meeting in the reading-room, which the doctor called. I did not want to take any interest in it. I did not sign the paper at first. It was got up at tea-time one day, and I signed next day. I did not wish to sign it, and I told them so (for reasons best known to myself). I changed my mind because of a statement on the back, meaning that, though I had previously made statements complaining, that now I refused to sign. I heard them—Campbell, Impey, and others—say it would be unmanly not to sign, and then I signed. I do not think this was a proper way to make a complaint to the doctor. After I took charge I was led to believe that it was my duty, if there was anything wrong with the food, to go to Mr. Stewart and show it to him. I once complained to Mr. Stewart of some marmalade that was fermented. This happened three or six weeks before the present trouble. I thought the jam was fairly good. I would not have returned it myself. Annan was the man who handed it to me, and said it was the wish of the table that I should take it to Mr. Stewart. Mr. Stewart told me to take it to the kitchen.

136. *By Dr. King.*] Before this paper was got up, about some days before I heard some of them were going to complain, I was present, two days (about) before the meeting called by the doctor, when Blacklaws brought some fish, saying it was for his own table—No. 1. The others rushed him to get the fish for themselves. He, to save it, put it on the window-sill, and said if they rushed him he would throw it out of the window. It did go out of the window, plate and all. It was a large dish of fish. The patients were in the hall at the time. Four or five men were in the rush—Buckley, Aicheson, Perry, and Clarkson. Those are the only ones I remember. The tea was poured over my trousers—a cup I had just poured out. I was present at the meeting called by the attendants when Mr. Impey read what professed to be a report of what had previously taken place. I heard this report read. It was so long, and there were so many big words, that I cannot remember all of it. Among other things, it said that the doctor had called either the attendants or Impey "liars." I did not hear the doctor call any one "liars." I heard Buckley say Mr. Stewart was a liar, or it may have been the clerk. Buckley said, "Do you mean to call us a lot of liars, Dr. King?" There had been grumbling several times before the first meeting. All were pretty near the same. At tea-time one day, before any meeting, Arundel of his own accord went out from the table to the doctor and complained. The doctor came in at once. Arundel said to the doctor in my presence that there was no butter, and that he had not made a meal that day. He said something about the fish. Later on he said it was some coarse-looking fish that looked like whale or shark. I did not take any. It was proper. It looked quite good. I never saw it sent back uneaten.

138. *By Dr. King.*] How did I treat the complaints?—You said you would look into them.

139. Did I tell the attendants myself at the first meeting that special care was to be taken with the cooking of porridge, meat, and vegetables?—You did.

140. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I have heard no complaints of the food since the matter was brought before the doctor. I have not seen anything to complain of since.

141. *By Dr. King.*] I have never seen you inconsiderate in your treatment of any of the attendants. You have always treated me like a gentleman.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL, sworn, examined.

142. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I signed this paper because I thought there was a grievance with the food. I did not hear the doctor use those words. I heard him say that what had been reported

about breakages must have been malicious, for the quantity. That is all I noticed. I thought he had been misinformed. There were a large number of breakages. There have been breakages the last few weeks: the fish-dish, a basin I lifted, which fell and broke. I took it to Stewart. That is all I know of since.

143. *By Dr. King.*] I did not hear you use the term "liars," but you used "untruth." You said the action about the fish was "bordering on savagery."

144. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] Dr. King always behaved to me like a gentleman and showed great kindness.

JAMES McCONKEY, sworn, examined.

145. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an attendant. I signed the petition merely to show we were unanimous about the food. I did not hear the expressions said to be used by Dr. King.

146. *By Dr. King.*] I did not hear you call any of them "liars."

147. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] Dr. King has never behaved harshly or tyrannically to me.

HENRY SHEPPARD sworn, examined.

148. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I signed merely about the food. I did not hear the expressions alleged in the petition. Dr. King has never behaved harshly or tyrannically to me. I never heard him call any one a liar.

FRANK DUNCAN, sworn, examined.

149. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I was on probation as attendant three for months. I received notice I was not suitable. I asked to be allowed to remain, as work was hard to get. My request was granted. I have made some inquiries for work. I was allowed to remain as a favour. I signed the paper about the improper cooking. I was not at the meeting, and did not hear the expressions used in the first half of the paper. I was present when the paper was drawn up. I did not hear the doctor call any one a liar. He never gave me any encouragement. He spoke quite kindly when telling me I was not fitted for asylum work. He allowed me to remain, or to leave at any time if I got a job within a reasonable time.

SEACLIFF, MONDAY, 2ND JANUARY, 1893.

ADAM RUSSELL sworn, examined.

150. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an attendant. The quality of the food has been the same as ever—that is, it was good. The salt meat in the morning was pretty often underdone.

151. *By Dr. King.*] I do not remember that the salt meat was complained of when you came into the hall. The porridge might have been complained of, but no other article at the breakfast.

152. *By Dr. Macgregor.*] About the fish for dinner?—It was the same as it has always been served. The groper was good and well cooked. At our table we still had butter. Only at one table the butter was used up. We had most to complain of the potatoes; they were old and waxy, as always at the end of the year.

153. *By Dr. King.*] I signed the petition. I paid little attention to its contents. All that I meant in signing was that we had a just grievance about the imperfectly cooked food. I cannot say that I heard you state in the reading-room that the complaints were fictitious, concocted to disparage certain individuals, and that they had no foundation. I heard none of these statements.

154. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I did not hear the doctor call the attendants "liars." When the cook came in, I heard the doctor say to her, in stating what had happened, that the attendants evidently believed what they stated. The doctor remedied the food at once.

155. *By Dr. King.*] On the Wednesday evening you came to the table. On the Thursday we had the official ration.

156. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] On Thursday evening the doctor called a meeting and explained the result of his inquiries. The paper was signed by most at breakfast on Friday morning. On Monday the letter was sent to Dr. King, asking him to meet the attendants, and the last meeting was held on Monday night. When I approved the calling of the meeting and signed the paper I understood that we wanted to be unanimous about our food. The meeting took quite a different form from what I expected. I disapproved at the meeting of anything like an apology, for there was nothing to apologize for after the food was remedied. I only came in during the latter part of the last meeting on Thursday. I remember hearing Buckley get up and say something. I think he spoke in an excited way.

ARTHUR JAMES WATTS, sworn, examined.

157. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an attendant. The quality of food was good. There was nothing wrong with it. At one time, for about a month, the bread was not so good as usual. I think the flour was faulty.

158. The cooking?—Very often the meat was very much underdone in the centre. The fish complained of was groper. It was quite fresh, and was well cooked. Fish was always well cooked, and properly served in every way. I heard the doctor say, at the first complaint, that he would do his best to put things right; and it was done. After this I signed a paper still about the food, but more particularly in connection with a remark passed by the doctor, that, "in his opinion, the agitation was headed and originated with only a few." I signed to show we were unanimous. I heard Impey say he thought the doctor should apologize for insinuating that he was a liar. I did not hear the doctor say that Impey was a liar. He did not call any one a liar.

159. *By Dr. King.*] Did you, in presence of Tattersall and Impey, tell Arundel that I had called the attendants "conspirators, liars, and savages"?—I do not remember having done so. I did not use the word "liar."

160. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I did not hear the doctor say that the statements made by Impey were fictitious, and concocted to disparage certain individuals.

LIONEL FRYE, sworn, examined.

161. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an attendant. I came last April. Then the food was abundant and all right. After a time the attendants complained to Mr. Stewart about the bread not being properly baked; but it was looked into and remedied as soon as possible. After that the meat was not properly cooked, except when the cook was relieved. The meat was greatly underdone at times. The fish was always good and well cooked. I am fond of fish and always took some. I never saw fish on the table that was not fit for any one to eat, no matter who they were. I was present when the doctor was called on by Arundel to complain of the food. He said he would see into the matter. The doctor was not the least angry then. Since then the cooking could not be complained of by any one. I did not hear any of the offensive statements attributed to the doctor. I and the others signed the paper simply to show we were unanimous in making the complaints about the food. I never heard anything said that required an apology. It was only indirectly I heard of an apology being wanted. The only thing approaching offensiveness which I heard the doctor say was in speaking to Arundel, who spoke in such a way that I would have spoken sharply myself in the doctor's place.

DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 2ND JANUARY, 1893.

EDWIN TATTERSALL, sworn and examined.

162. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I was attendant at Seacliff. I complain that because I refused to play in the band when off duty Mr. Stewart tyrannized over me and made me uncomfortable ever after: and then I made up my mind to leave. The meat was usually so underdone as not to be eatable, to my taste. The joints were of inferior quality. Day after day we got the shoulder and the neck. We did not get the joints in fair rotation. This was reported to the Doctor and Mr. Stewart on several occasions. I did not report it myself. I could not swear who did so. I was not present when Dr. King was called in to see the meat. I attended the second meeting one evening. There had been another earlier that day. Impey came forward, when Arundel left the meeting, to represent the rest. He went to the doctor, who disputed our statements, and said we were "liars," and that the discontent emanated from a few, which was not true. The doctor said to Impey, "You are the only one who speaks." Impey said he acted for the rest. I got up and indorsed all Impey said. The cook was called in and admitted irregularities in distributing the meat. I signed the petition. I am aware that the doctor said it would be seen to for the future; and it was all right after. The idea of the petition was to show that we were unanimous. I believe the demand for an apology from the doctor for things he had said about the attendants was part of the petition.

DUNEDIN, TUESDAY, 3RD JANUARY, 1893.

ANNIE MULQUIN, sworn, examined.

163. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am cook. I never heard a complaint, nor saw a joint returned but one, and that was taken in mistake, having been laid aside half-cooked. It was taken out of the oven because Mrs. Beswick did not need it that day.

WILLIAM NELSON KERR, sworn, examined.

164. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an attendant. I never saw meat so much underdone as not to be eatable, except on one occasion. I returned it to the kitchen. It was not half-cooked. I called Mr. Stewart's attention to it. It was a leg of mutton.

THOMAS SNEESTON, sworn, examined.

165. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] Sometimes in the morning the salt beef at breakfast was underdone. I could always eat it. I never complained, and I never grumbled about it. I heard others doing so. Some of them could not eat it unless it was very well done. In signing the paper I meant to complain of the food. I signed because the others did, and I did not like to stand out. I have never seen Dr. King harsh or tyrannical to anyone.

JOHN ADAM, sworn, examined.

166. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am an assistant clerk. At our table we get the same meat, cooked in the same way, as the attendants. I have never got undercooked meat since I came to the Asylum, two years and a-half ago. At our table our only extras are milk puddings at dinner, and bacon and egg in the morning. Linton gets the same. We do not get custards. I never heard of this agitation till afterwards. I never knew of any discontent with the food. The vegetables were always well cooked. I never take porridge. Bread was always well baked. At one time a complaint was made about the flour. It was not bad.

HUBERT DENOON LINTON, sworn, examined.

167. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I am a clerk. Once for about a week the bread was complained of. The flour was not first-class, but the bread was perfectly wholesome. The flour was sent back and better put in its place after about a week's use. The joints were not properly divided, because the butcher did not carry out my orders. I never heard a word about it before the meeting. The meat was not as a rule underdone. I thought it overdone.

PORT CHALMERS, TUESDAY, 3RD JANUARY, 1893.

FREDERICK HENRY BUCKLEY, sworn, examined.

168. *By Dr. MacGregor.*] I signed a paper complaining of the food and cooking. At times the cooking was inferior; often the joints were inferior. The doctor put this right as soon as the complaint was made. This paper was signed after the doctor's promise. I signed to prove our unanimity. I wanted to show that Arundel and Impey were not alone in complaining. The doctor said some of Impey's statements were fictitious. I never heard him call anybody "a liar," or "liars." The doctor apologized as soon as he found he was misled by Linton. In the office I said I was very sorry to see this unfortunate row take place. I admit that it was disgraceful to behave as was done about the fish. I will not say we deserved to be called "savages," but I say it was very wrong.

REPORT by MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT, Seacliff Asylum, to INSPECTOR-GENERAL of ASYLUMS.
 SIR,—

Seacliff, 31st December, 1892.

I have the honour to comply with your request for an outline of the essential facts bearing upon the recent disturbance here with regard to the food.

On the evening of 23rd November ultimo Arundel met me in the outer office, and stated that the food was unfit for human consumption; he had not been able to take anything all day, and asked if I would go to the hall. He said: "There's only half a loaf of dry bread on our table, tea, and no butter." In the corridor, attendant Impey came up and made a similar complaint. In the hall some half-dozen of the attendants spoke as to the quality of different items of the dietary. It was acknowledged that the full allowance of butter had been received, but that it had been eaten; the porridge was stated by one of them to have been lumpy; the potatoes were said to have been inferior for dinner; and it was contended that there ought to be something more than bread and butter for tea. No other complaints were raised in regard to that day's viands, but it was stated that the meat was frequently underdone, the porridge had sometimes been lumpy, the vegetables were from time to time badly cooked, no sauce was supplied with the cauliflowers, and attendant Watts stated that on three separate occasions he had found a slug in the cabbage. The leading objections appeared to be in regard to the cooking of the porridge, roast meat, and vegetables, and specially in regard to the quality and cooking of the potatoes. I said I would look carefully into the matter, with a view to having the food more to their taste. As regards the porridge, I said there could be no excuse for having it badly cooked; that the degree to which the meat should be roasted was largely a matter of individual taste; and that, as from what they had said they seemed on a whole to prefer it well done, I would see that their wish was complied with. I said that all vegetables should be well cooked, but that potatoes, at the extreme end of the season, could not be at their best. On inquiry, the matron informed me that it was very rarely indeed that things were imperfectly cooked, but that on one morning of the week porridge had been somewhat lumpy, owing to the illness of Mrs. Geeson, and the fact of some other person having to make it. That her meat was cooked precisely as the attendants' joints, and that it was never underdone. That the potatoes had only recently become somewhat inferior in quality, and that they and the other vegetables were well cooked. The statements of Messrs. Linton, Adam, and Stewart coincided with this. They had not complained, and neither meat nor vegetables were in their opinion underdone, though the cooking was identical.

The matron stated that the supply of extras during the winter had been unusually large; that, on the average, there had been hot meat or jam two or three times a week, and cold meat on the other nights. It did not happen once a month that there was only bread and butter. There would have been marmalade on the night in question, but for the fact that though perfectly good the attendants had refused to eat it on a recent occasion.

On inquiry as to the nature of the attendants' dinner on the day complained of, I found that it consisted of baked hapuka, and that most of it had been returned to the kitchen uneaten, the dish from one table being absolutely untouched. The fish had been kept, and I found on examination that it was of good quality. The clerk took the untouched cut the next day to the Deputy-Inspector, from whom the attached reply was received. Moreover, at my own table, we had dined on a slice of the same fish, cooked in the same way, and taken at random from one of the baking-tins in the general kitchen, and had found the quality and cooking excellent; indeed, we had no other meat. No badly cooked food was submitted to me in proof of the attendant's assertions, and no hint so far as I know was given that they disliked hapuka, a viand which they had had only a few times in the season.

I was informed that on the previous evening, before the assembled patients, there had been a quarrel in the hall among the attendants over some fried fish, during which cups of tea were overturned, and which ended in the large dish and contents being thrown out of the window. A new tablecloth was brought to me with three parallel gashes, each fully four inches long, which it was hard to suppose had been done accidentally. These facts had not been reported by the attendants in accordance with the rules of the establishment. Taking into account these things, and the fact that my own experience, from frequent and repeated tasting of the food in the kitchen, tended to confirm the statements of the matron and others, I decided to order the official rations for the day without extras, and in the evening called a meeting of the attendants to explain to them the cause of my action and the result of my inquiries. At the outset I said that an investigation of the matters they had brought before me had modified the views which, relying solely upon their statements, I had been inclined to entertain upon the previous evening. So far as any error might have been made in the cooking of viands I had given instructions that every care should be exercised; but I felt that the matter had not been fairly put to me. To show how large a quantity of extras had been issued I had allowed them for that one day the bare official ration only. I told them that I did not intend to make any reduction in their extras, but that in my opinion there was certainly no

ground for adding to them. Attendant Arundel's statement that the fish was unfit for human consumption was untrue, and I regretted he was not at the meeting: That in quarrelling over the fish and throwing the dish out of the window, especially before the patients, they were acting like savages rather than civilised men, and such behaviour would not be tolerated: Further, that I could scarcely conceive that the cutting of the tablecloth had been done unintentionally; and that in any case they had failed to carry out their duty in not reporting it. A number of remarks were made by attendant Impey, among others one insinuating that a statement of mine in regard to a certain viand having been supplied to them frequently was untrue, at least he had never seen or heard of such viands having been supplied to the attendants. Though a number of the attendants have since professed that Impey was acting as their agent, not one of them traversed his statement, and subsequent reference to the store department revealed the fact that three times in May, and twice in June, the particular viand (tripe and onions) was supplied to them. Another statement made by Impey was that they did not see on their own tables such joints as were supplied to the matron and clerks. The meeting was adjourned, and I met the attendants about half an hour later, after having consulted the clerk and matron in regard to some points which had been raised. There was one matter and one only in which I made an error—viz., in asserting on the clerk's authority that the meat had been given to them in a definite rotation of joints, and this to my mind affords the clearest indication of the want of broad foundations for most of the other statements made by the men. I had no sooner spoken than three attendants who had previously been silent (Impey, Arundel, and Clark having been the only speakers) stood up excitedly, and attendant Buckley asked whether I wished to call them liars. I may observe that this was the only occasion on which the term liar was used, and then by an attendant. I pointed out that, as they had been silent, there had been no reason to suppose that they agreed with Impey, but that now several of them had spoken I felt confident some mistake had been made. The cook and matron were sent for, and the issue appears in a statement of mine which you took down yesterday with Arundel's evidence.

During the next few days Mr. Stewart reported to me that several of the attendants had told him that some of them were getting up a round-robin, and that they wanted me to apologize. Judging from this, and from the demeanour of several of the attendants, that the matter could not rest where it was, I took the first train to town on the Monday morning, and, accompanied by one of the official visitors, the Hon. George McLean, waited on the Deputy Inspector, Mr. Chapman, and asked if he would come out and look into the matter, because I felt that from the insolent demeanour and language of attendants Arundel, Impey, and Clark it would be better to have some independent person of authoritative position to examine into the merits of the case. Mr. Chapman could not leave his business, and Mr. McLean at great personal inconvenience consented to come, after my urging upon him the desirability of getting the matter settled. In the afternoon I received a note from Impey asking, on behalf of the attendants, my presence at a meeting. Mr. McLean saw the three charge-attendants individually, and then went to the meeting. After explaining that Mr. McLean had been asked to attend in his official capacity, and making a statement of the facts of the case, I intended to leave the room, in order that the attendants might have no possible excuse or constraint in speaking their minds; but was asked by Impey to stay and hear a report which he had made. This report, which was handed to you yesterday, is such a tissue of misstatements, and is so insolent and improper in its whole tone, that it needs no comment. I again turned to leave the room, when Impey said he wished to hand me a document from the attendants. I was not present at the rest of the meeting. Mr. McLean informed me afterwards that attendant Impey's attitude was utterly defiant and unreasonable, and said that he ought to leave the Service at once. He could say nothing regarding Arundel and Clark, because they had kept silence. Several of the attendants stood up and suggested that the matter should be dropped.

F. TRUBY KING.

STATEMENT handed in by Mr. IMPEY, and read at a meeting of the staff.

The object of this meeting is to ask the doctor to remove the stigma which he has unjustly thrust upon us, and to retract those statements in which he accuses us of being "liars and conspirators"—accusations which we say are untrue, and we are prepared to substantiate the proofs previously adduced. How the doctor has arrived at the illiberal conclusions which he has done, can unless he chooses to enlighten us, only remain a matter of conjecture. He has stated that the discontent that was emanated from a very small section of malcontents who had not been long in the service, and not from the majority of the attendants, or from those who had been here a length of time. To that assertion I gave a decided denial, stating that the oldest members of the staff were as emphatic and as persistent in their denunciations as were those recently appointed to that body; and further, that the whole body of attendants dining in the hall were perfectly unanimous in the complaint, without even one exception. The doctor, replying to this fact, characterizes it as a deliberate lie, he having proof that such was not the case; but when asked to submit the name of any individual, declined—I presume through being unable so to do. Our complaints were of a very mild nature, simply protesting at the mismanagement of the diet, and the arbitrary measures adopted by the doctor in cancelling articles of diet, which, although not actually on the dietary scale, had been received and recognised as part of such, together with the false, harsh, and cruel epithets with which he characterized our conduct as malicious and infamous, comparing us to and telling us that we are savages, and as such he would have no hesitation or compunction in treating us; and I particularly wish to draw attention to this remark, for it is an utterance unworthy of a man and unbecoming a gentleman. By such unjust slander, is it any wonder that our innocence resents at the indignities so unsparingly levied upon our respectability. Firstly, in reference to the complaint as first told to him, he says he was told before coming into the hall by those who inter-

viewed him that they did not know what had become of the butter. In explanation, let me say the doctor remarked, "If you have no butter, then what has become of it: it must have been taken away." To which I replied, "No; it has been eaten, but would not have, had we some substitute, in which case the butter would last out the week." Secondly, as regards to the inferior cooking, he ventured to say, he had himself known instances in which the meat was not properly cooked; and upheld our grievance by stating that he knew no earthly reason why that should be so, for, with the luxurious appliances which the cook had at her command, there could be no reasonable excuse for such a failing. Now, I ask you to bear these utterances in mind when we come to consider the action he has taken in this matter. Whilst I am referring to the meat, I may mention a point which has been settled. It was stated we had sent to us a great many joints in which there was more bone than meat, compared to the preponderance of meat on superior joints, and stated that as a possible reason why our meat-supply at times appeared insufficient, in combating which statement the doctor remarked it was perfectly ridiculous, and that he refused to believe it, even though it was borne out by the evidence of those whom he says are savages, and hesitates not to treat us as such. In preference to believing their undivided testimony, he accepts the bald statement of one whose duty it appears to have been to see that article of diet fairly distributed; and, through one man neglecting his duty, whether intentionally or in ignorance I dare not assume; but this I do say, in fervent sincerity, that to accept the bald statement of one individual, unsupported by any proof whatever, against the undivided evidence of the majority, is, to put it mildly, most unjust and very unimpartial. It is a direct endeavour to crush and stamp out legitimate justice. It was only when the testimony of another person was produced that Dr. King withdrew his unjust accusations, which evidence, I think, ought to and could have been procured before those aspersions were cast upon us. And the elaborate elegance with which the doctor defended his ignorance of the management of such matters reflect upon him the gravest discredit. Fourthly, the evidence bearing on the inferior cooking of the vegetables was sufficient to convince any reasonable mind, and for the present I shall content myself with remarking that the difference which has taken place, is a proof of the justice of our complaints; for at the present time everything is in thorough working order. It appears to me that all these points are precisely similar; and how a man can give a favourable verdict in one instance and condemn us in another, the evidence being unanimity exemplified, to me, at any rate, requires explaining. Now, there is another matter, which affects myself alone—that is, concerning those tripe and onions, the reference to which brought down on me showers of malicious infamy. He said that the matron had told him that the occasions upon which we did not have made-up dishes for tea were very seldom, and instanced tripe and onions as one of those dishes, and an extra to which we were not entitled. Admitted it is an extra, is that any reason I should allow this false statement to go unchallenged. I emphatically say it is not; and I mentioned, in refuting the accuracy of the doctor's remarks, bearing upon the frequency with which those dishes were served up to us, that during my service at this Asylum, dating back to the 7th of April of this year, I had never once seen tripe and onions, and never heard of it until mentioned by himself. The Superintendent, referring to these remarks, says they are deliberate lies, told with the avowed object of reflecting disparagingly upon the matron, and, in fact, it was a malicious intent to deceive. I think I might be pardoned when, in my ignorance, I gave the doctor credit for a nicer sense of justice. When manliness and truthfulness are so ruthlessly trodden on, when tyrannical measures are adopted to suppress the admission of truth and respectability, is it, I ask, any wonder that there are those to be found who are afraid of losing their living if they were manly, straightforward, and consistent.

MEMORANDUM BY ATTENDANTS.

Seacliff Asylum, 25th November, 1892.

Dr. King has asserted that the statements made to him in the patients' dining-hall, and which I, Matthew Impey, re-stated at the meeting of attendants held by order of the Superintendent, in the reading-room of the Asylum, were fictitious; statements which he said were concocted for the purpose of disparaging certain individuals, and were absolutely without foundation; that it did not express unanimously the feelings of the majority of the attendants. He states that the discontent emanates from a very small number of malcontents, who have only been a short time in the service; further, that we have no just causes for complaint. The purport of our complaint is this: That frequently the meat has been insufficiently cooked to be palatable, and has on several occasions been sent back as uneatable; the vegetables have from time to time only been partially cooked, and that without salt; and, if a stew or other dish were sent in for tea, made from the leavings of the joints which we may have had for dinner more frequently, our allowance of butter would last out the week, instead of, as at the present time, lasting only four or five days, necessitating in some instances our having to use dry bread alone for tea. We, the undersigned attendants, attest our signatures to the veracity of the complaints herein contained:—

Stanley Blacklaws.	Arthur J. Watts.	John Aitcheson.	W. Perry.
John Marr.	John Kilgour.	James McConkey.	Andrew Wilson.
Frank P. Duncan.	Thomas Sneeston.	Jas. M. Arundel.	Edwin Tattersall.
Henry E. Sheppard.	Wm. Campbell.	John Clarkson.	Alexander Annan.
John Clark.	Adam Russell.	Lionel Frye.	J. Pullar.
John Heigh.	Andrew Miller.	F. H. Buckley.	H. Downes.

MEMORANDUM.—Attendant Harry Downes fully indorses the complaints as herein contained, and is prepared at any time to substantiate the statements referred to, but objects to attach his name to paper.

MEMORANDUM BY THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR OF LUNATIC ASYLUMS.

November 26th, 1892.

I was just going into Court when the clerk called and showed me the piece of proper which the men had rejected, and had no time to discuss the matter or I would have asked him to show it to an eating-house keeper. It appeared to me to be first-class food. I think you had better inquire as to who originated the movement to discredit it. These things generally begin with one man, and the rest follow; indeed it may be regarded as an instinctive movement to follow and believe a suggestion condemning such food as meat and fish. The blame is with the first who unreasonably condemns it; nobody at the same table can afterwards eat with comfort.

Dr. King, Seacliff.

FRED. CHAPMAN,
Deputy Inspector.

MEMORANDUM by Attendant CLARK in reference to his DISMISSAL.

The doctor asked to see me in his office to-day. I went in, and there were present: Dr. King, Mr. Adam and Mr. Stewart. The doctor said he wanted to speak to me in reference to my actions during the last few days. He said he was surprised, as it was altogether different to my general behaviour. He also said that he was sure that I had been led away by others, and incited to the part I had taken in the complaints. He said that this was the first occasion that he ever had to find fault with me; and that when I attached my name to the document containing the complaints, and also as a proof of unanimity amongst the staff, I had been guilty of insolence, and in fact gross insubordination towards the Superintendent. He said that if I expressed my regret, and say that I was sorry that I had done such a thing, he would overlook the matter altogether. I answered that I had not been led away or incited by any one into the part I had taken. That I signed my name of my own freewill, believing that we had just cause for complaint, and had so for some considerable time past, and was of the same opinion still; that I had no occasion to alter my mind on that point. He seemed not altogether satisfied with my answer, and introduced something I had said in reference to a statement of his at one of our meetings. The statement was this: That while we were complaining of the bad cooking, &c., he noticed a peculiar fact in connection with every or most new attendants coming to the place, that they invariably put on a stone in weight during the first month or six weeks. I replied that I was one of those attendants he was referring to, and that I did not consider the extra weight due to nutritious qualities of the food, but more to bracing airs about here, it being a very healthy place. Speaking for myself, I hold the same opinion still. Now, he said that when I dared to say such a thing I was very insolent indeed. He then made me the offer again, that if I apologized he would overlook it. I refused to do so, hence my dismissal, which I consider a very arbitrary proceeding indeed on his part, and for which I intend to demand an explanation.

STATEMENT of ASSISTANT CLERK and HEAD ATTENDANT relative to Attendant CLARK'S Dismissal.

ATTENDANT CLARK, spoken to by Dr King: Dr King said that he viewed Attendant Clark's conduct in regard to the recent difficulties in connection with the food as possibly resulting from his being led away by others; that if this was the case, and he expressed regret, he (Dr. King) was willing to overlook his insolence and disrespectful attitude, and the fact of his having unjustifiably signed a document asking the Medical Superintendent to apologise. Attendant Clark replied that he had acted entirely of his own freewill, that he had expressed his own opinions, and that he still adhered to the signing of the paper asking Dr. King to apologise. Dr. King informed him that his services would be dispensed with at a month's notice.

The foregoing is a correct report of what took place, we being present.

JOHN ADAMS, Assistant Clerk.

29th November, 1892.

ROBERT STEWART, Head Attendant.

STATEMENT of Attendant SNEESTON, *re* Injury to Patient RODERICK BRODERICK.

JAMES MCKIBBIN and Broderick were quarrelling in the yard, and I went over to them and asked Broderick to come inside, and he refused to come. He had been hit on the eye by McKibbin. I then caught hold of him, when he caught hold of me by the neck of the vest. Attendant Tattersall then came to my assistance, when Broderick also seized hold of him by the neck of the vest. The No. 3 men were then coming up to the hall for breakfast, and Attendant Campbell came to our assistance, and he kicked Campbell on the knee. Two patients—Pat O'Neill and James Whelan—came to assist Broderick, Whelan catching Tattersall round the neck. O'Neill had a slipper in his hand to throw at some of us, but he then turned and threw two of the patients on the grass plot. We then succeeded in getting Broderick inside, and put him in a cell. He started kicking and fighting, and with strength we laid him down in the cell and held him there until he was quiet and said he would stop; and we then locked him in the cell and came out into the yard.

By Dr. King: What state was Whelan in?—He got up in a temper when he saw us struggling with Broderick.

Was there any unnecessary force used by any of you?—No, sir, not at all.

29th November, 1892.

THOMAS SNEESTON.

Attendant TATTERSALL'S statement coincides with the above.

Attendant CAMPBELL'S statement coincides with the above. He also says that "during the whole time I have been in the Asylum, and I was nine months in the refractory yard, I never saw

the yard in such an excited state. I was afraid there would be a mutiny. There was no unnecessary force used, not in the least. The man was lifted off his feet and carried inside."

The patient Whelan, who saw the affair and took part in it, says that the patient Broderick was very gently handled, considering the wild state he was in and the row that was going on. He says that he himself took part in the affair because he thought it was not fair for three men to be getting the better of one. Besides, Broderick was a Catholic. He cried "Ireland for ever," because his father used to cry that before him.—J. T. KING.

DEAR MR. IMPEY,—

Seacliff, 7th December, 1892.

You have asked me to give you my opinion concerning the matter that led up to the informal meeting held by Dr. King *re* certain complaints about the attendants' food, and I am glad to have the opportunity to state my views in as concise a form as possible. Although absent from the meeting, I would be stating an untruth if I said I was not cognisant of the reasons on which the complaint was grounded. You will, of course, know I am leaving almost immediately, by the doctor's permission. He asked me if I had any specific reason for leaving. I replied that I had several; although I only mentioned one reason, that reason being the bad cooking, as I think it is the one which is at present uppermost, and also the primary cause of the trouble which culminated in the attendants affixing their signatures to the complaint. This complaint would, I am sure, have received unanimity long ago, and been placed in the doctor's hands to be remedied, but, as is well known, certain members of the staff hung back, presumably, I suppose, because might against right is a lever, I am sorry to say, is too often used by the doctor, who, if he ferreted the facts out for himself in a straightforward manner without running to Mr. Stewart about everything, would allay much dissatisfaction. Mr. Stewart, as we all know, must acquiesce with the doctor's decision rightly or wrongly, following as a matter of course from the doctor's inherited hatred of being contradicted, and his disapproval of hearing anything in the way of a suggestion from the staff.

I have for the last four or five months intended writing to the doctor concerning the cooking on my own responsibility, and now, I assure you, I am heartily sorry I did not get it done.

Well, about the remarks that passed between the doctor and myself. In the first place I told him I should certainly have signed the paper indorsing the complaint. I said the whole matter was a simple one, inasmuch as it only required a simple remedy. I told him Mr. Stewart had been told time after time about the bad cooking, and that he almost invariably made the reply, "Oh, I will see the doctor about it," and there the matter has invariably ended. The doctor, even at this time, some days after the meeting, did not seem to realise or must have failed to arrive at the fountain-head of the trouble, as all he could say was that it was most extraordinary. I specifically drew his attention to the fish as a matter of much grumbling, as it was a diet requiring something in the way of sauce being served up with it to make it appetising. He replied he had the very same fish on his own table, and "really," he said, "it was remarked how excellent it was." He said the sauce had sunk into it. Well, to discuss in detail, I think I am right in saying that the sauce the doctor was thinking of at the time was nothing more than the water the fish was boiled in. I admit proper sauce has been served up on several occasions, but it has been conspicuous by its absence in the majority of times we have had groper.

Another reason my wishing to quit the place is the generally irritating and countermanding of orders, as issued between the doctor and Mr. Stewart, and the continued nagging Mr. Stewart pursues regarding certain attendants, myself at times included. Dr. King's knowledge also of the general routine in detail of the institution really appears so limited that his decisions are largely arrived at through secondhand information supplied by Mr. Stewart. Another cause which breeds ill-feeling towards the doctor by the attendants is his haughty, irascible, and overbearing disposition, so that it is impossible that the great majority of the attendants can entertain a friendly feeling for him. Suffice it to say, he has not the knack of controlling so comparatively a large body of men. It has long amongst the attendants been considered as a matter of course that to expect justice and get grievances remedied, and get him to listen impartially to any complaint from the attendants, is a thing quite foreign to his nature.

If an attendant here has a grievance and he speaks out his mind, perhaps in effect reflecting on the management of the institution, that man I say is marked, watched, and continually being harassed in his duties, which in the end makes him lose all interest in his work, and in the end he is dismissed on some trumped-up charge and considered a convenient riddance. As an instance, I have only to mention the names of Arundel, Clark, and yourself, who have been manly enough to speak out your minds concerning the matter, and who have been dismissed, or will be—why? forsooth because you dared to tell him the plain unvarnished facts, and it is at your sacrifice that the food is served up now, I believe, in a way that we all testify our approval of.

I do not hesitate to say the doctor has treated Arundel, Clark, and yourself like martyrs. I do not know whether the matter of the bread was brought up, but I wish to say that the baking and firing of the loaves has frequently been shameful in the extreme. Often have I seen it for a fortnight at a time (at least) in a state of dough or putty, and all we could eat was the crust. The proportion of the inside of a loaf to the crust is, I should think, something like the parts 90 to 100. At such times, which were very frequent, the inside of the loaves were left untouched—I suppose were eventually thrown to the pigs. We receive eleven or twelve loaves per day. The doctor is so unreasonable and purblind in his nature that he rides rough-shod over justice, never as much as thinking of the attendants' interests as a whole, but rather on the other hand casting his weather-eye to his own interests, and endeavouring to make his position more tenable and unassailable to the unsuspecting public.

Regarding Mr. Stewart, it is an indisputable fact that he is more frightened of the doctor than I think any member of the staff. It will suffice to mention only one instance, viz.: From

what other cause can Mr. Stewart's action, in failing to report the bad cooking, be attributable to than his fear of the doctor when the attendants' interests are brought up. From my point of view, also, the matron is largely to blame, as she is, I believe, supposed to see the cooking is properly carried out. At all events the doctor seemed to have tried hard to make a case out against the staff, simply because he jumped to the conclusion that you wished to make disparaging remarks about one or two of the Asylum officials. The matron, I presume, was one of them; and all we know about the matron is, that she is in some degree answerable for the bad cooking, else why did the doctor try to defend her.

No one can dispute the fact that if the head of a Lunatic Asylum does not treat his attendants in a gentlemanly, just, and straight-forward manner, he cannot look for that respect and good-feeling which are the first essential points which should exist between him and the staff.

What other spirit fosters the general feeling than that the doctor treats us as inferior beings, than his manner and air, and lofty stand-alooft-style, when approached by any of us. We do not like it; and I am afraid one of Dr. King's weak points is his inability to grasp and lay square the corner-stone, to speak illustratively, of his utter want of tact in dealing with the attendants.

And until Dr. King recognises this essential feature in his government of the institution, it will be hopeless for him to succeed in superintending the Asylum without his clashing with the attendants in any other way than is indicated by the partial and sycophantic report that, somehow or other, he succeeds year after year in obtaining.

SIDNEY MAXWELL.

SIR,—

Seacliff, 30th December, 1895.

In reply to your favour of this date, I may say that I am not prepared to go on with the case at such short notice; all papers in connection with the affair are in Mr. Impey's possession, and I think we are entitled to receive notice at least a day before you hold an inquiry. Trusting you will see your way to grant so fair a request.

I have, &c.,

Dr. MacGregor.

JAS. M. ARUNDEL.

P.S.—I think it only fair that Impey and Clark should be present with myself.

SIR,—

Dunedin, 1st January, 1893.

I intend to continue my inquiry at Seacliff to-morrow. I shall be glad to hear from you, before the express leaves to-morrow, the names of any persons you desire to be examined. If you desire to give any further evidence I shall pay your expenses.

I have, &c.,

Mr. Impey, Pier Hotel.

D. MACGREGOR.

P.S.—If to-morrow is not convenient, please let me know before eleven a.m.

MINUTES relating to Attendant IMPEY'S DISMISSAL (marked "X").

Dr. King: you were absent from duty last night, without leave?

Impey: Yes. I did not miss the train. I could not telegraph; but I concluded that if I had asked for leave it would have been granted; therefore I did not return.

Dr. King: You are aware that you stopped away when you were on duty, and you did it knowingly?

Impey: Yes.

J. T. K.

Dr. King: You need not go on duty again.

Witness—H. D. LINTON, 7.15 p.m., 27th December, 189 2.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,425 copies), £13 10s.

By Authority: SAMUEL COSTALL, Government Printer, Wellington.—1893.

Price 9d.]