

3 For 7 Limerick Esy
‘ We should never allow personal feeling to influence us in the discharge of a public duty.’

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF AN INQUIRY

IN REFERENCE

TO MATTERS CONNECTED WITH

THE

LIMERICK DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM

AND

A CORRESPONDENCE ARISING THEREOUT,

BETWEEN

THE GOVERNMENT AND ONE OF THE GOVERNORS.

TO

THE RIGHT HONBLE. SIR ROBERT PEEL, BART.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND,

IN ORDER

TO GIVE HIM A LITTLE INSIGHT TO

THE MANNER IN WHICH WE,

UNDER SECRETARIES, AND LUNATICS, COMMISSIONERS, GOVERNORS, INSPECTORS,

MANAGERS, CLERKS, AND CONTRACTORS,

DO THE THING IN IRELAND.

THESE PAGES ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY HIS OBEDIENT AND HUMBLE SERVANT,

D. J. WILSON.

Houses of the Oireachtas

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR ROBERT PEEL, BART.

&c., &c.

Sir,

Few events have occurred, more calculated to excite "surprise," among all creeds, and classes in Ireland—than your arrival on our shores—as Chief Secretary.

But judging from your bearing in the House, (however unpalatable not a few of your observations to the great majority of the Irish people), it will, I think, be a matter of "no surprise" if you act up to your pledge upon the hustings—to discharge your duties "straight forward, and—without finesse."

Your assurance in reply to Mr. Blake, that, "you would give your attention to the state of our Lunatic Asylums"—confirmed me in my intention, the moment your appointment was announced, to dedicate to you the following pages.

Putting aside altogether, the question as to the "abstractions of entries" (but to which I uncompromisingly adhere,) you may amid the "many"—find "some" facts—not entirely unworthy of attention.

During the Secretaryship of your Sire, a committee was appointed to select the toasts to be given at a dinner to celebrate a political triumph in Galway. All went on swimmingly, until it was suggested by one of the committee to give—"Robert Peel, the sincere friend to Ireland, though conscientious opponent of the Roman Catholic claims."

The proposition was promptly met by another, which was—to throw the proposer out of the window—and as it was clear that Robert Peel was not *then* "the man for Galway," the toast was withdrawn—and the suggester was allowed to escape, the fate designed him.

The fulfilment of your pledge, to act the "straightforward," cannot fail to be productive of good. But unless it be required from subordinates—from the highest to the lowest—that they do follow in the footsteps of their Chief—little will avail the exertions of the "one" (even though he be the head) if thwarted by the "many."

In conclusion sir, I trust you to pardon, one—who has had not a few communications with Irish officials in his day, for suggesting—that in attempting to carry out your "straightforward" intentions—in other words "dealing out justice with an even hand"—"that publicity and openness, in every thing connected with its administration (where consistent with the public service) are the very best means of proving, that *it is* even handed."

That there is no more effectual means of keeping away "whisperers"—than by intimating, that an opportunity will be given to their intended victims—for explanation.

That you should carefully lock the several doors, leading from back stairs in Dublin Castle—and deposit the keys, in their proper bed—the slime of the Liffey.

That you see "even handed justice" (and we seek no more) dealt to Galway *port*—and Atlantic *subsidy* and I venture to predict—that the Son will, ere long—find himself—not alone the "man for Galway," but the "man for all Ireland"—and that however great the "surprise," upon his advent—still greater will be the "regret," of all classes, and all creeds—upon his departure from our Irish Shore.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

D. J. WILSON.

Belvoir, Sixmilebridge, August, 1861.

LIMERICK DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM,

&c.

From the Limerick Chronicle, December 22nd, 1860.

AN investigation, ordered by the Government, was conducted on Monday last, under the auspices of Dr. Nugent, Inspector of Lunatic Asylums, in the Board Room of the Limerick Asylum, into certain statements made by one of the Governors, David John Wilson, Esq., respecting the alleged tampering with certain entries in the provision report book, and which related to the meat contracts of the institution. Much interest was attached to the proceedings, as the result of the enquiry involved the position of officials connected with the establishment.

There were present the following Governors and gentlemen :—The Right Worshipful the Mayor, in the chair, Dr. Gibson, William Hartigan, John Singleton, William Howley, D.L., W. H. Maunsell, Thomas Boyse, John Watson Mahony, Esqrs.; Dr. Gelston, visiting Physician, and Dr. Nugent, Government Inspector.

There were also in attendance, Dr. Fitzgerald, resident manager of the Asylum; Mr. Bodkin, clerk and storekeeper; Mr. Laurence Kelly, meat contractor; and Mr. John M'Kern, printer and stationer.

Dr. Nugent opened the proceedings by observing, that he attended there that day in pursuance of a resolution of the Board of the 5th November, to the effect that Mr. D. J. Wilson had made a statement involving a charge against some person or persons in the establishment, for having tampered with the provision report book, and abstracted some leaves from it. He should have attended there sooner for the purpose of holding an investigation, and he trusted his absence had not been attributed to any want of respect to the governors, but on the 10th of that month Mr. Wilson presented his card to Lieut.-Colonel Larcom, stating that he had just received a telegram of a friend of his having been ill in Bath, and that he had to proceed there at once. Subsequently there was nothing whatever heard officially of or from Mr. Wilson, although he (Dr. Nugent) inquired at the Chief Secretary's office, until on the 30th of November, when a letter was written by Mr. Wilson requesting some document to be sent for him to Cruise's hotel in this city, but did not say a word about attending the next meeting. (a) He mentioned this to show that it was through no feeling of disrespect he did not hold that investigation earlier; but even had Mr. Wilson mentioned his intention of coming in to attend the meeting of that Board on the 3rd of December, he (Dr. Nugent) could

(a) The references throughout the following pages refer to notes upon the whole subject and the evidence, which will be found grouped together in the Appendix.

not have been there sooner from the pressure of public business in other parts of the country. He would now refer to the origin of this investigation and complaint. He believed it first occurred in April, 1860, when there were complaints made as to the quality of the meat. He believed the enquiry at that time was more of a conversational character than anything else, because on the minutes of the proceedings of that Board he found no reference made to it, so that he would infer that the Board did not think it of sufficient importance to have it entered on the minutes. (b) So the matter rested until the 7th of May, when he found, in reference to the storekeeper, whose position was more or less complicated in this transaction, a resolution unanimously recommending that, for his efficiency, Mr. Bodkin should have an increase of salary. After that meeting Mr. Wilson wrote a letter to the Lord Lieutenant, which his Excellency transmitted to him (Dr. Nugent), and which he would read.

Mr. Wilson.—You will see I made no complaint against the storekeeper in that letter, nor did I make, nor do I make, a charge against him, nor against any man.

Dr. Nugent wished it to be distinctly understood that what he said, or intended to convey, was that the storekeeper, if at all to blame, was only responsible for subsequent transactions, if such transactions occurred. A letter was then written on the 2nd of July—the day that Board met—and that letter asked whether any decision had been come to. He (Dr. Nugent), consequently, came down there on the 2nd of July, and he must candidly say that, having come down there, he expected to see Mr. Wilson at that meeting, and he observed at the Board that he was sorry they had not their friend Mr. Wilson there, and that he was very much disappointed, and he believed the Board felt so too. (c) He thought it was his duty then, as two of the officers there held their situations under the Lord Lieutenant, as there had been an imputation cast upon them, not to allow these imputations to rest upon them, as they would in the books of Dublin Castle, if left without being examined into. Some of the gentlemen there on that occasion (the 2nd of July) said they did not see any occasion for enquiring into these allegations. (d) However, he sent for Mr. Kelly and questioned him. The two physicians were in the room, and he suggested it would be better there should be nobody in the room except the Governors and himself, and, thereupon, those gentlemen withdrew. He questioned Mr. Kelly, and told him that certain charges affecting him had been made. He hoped he had conducted the enquiry without any bias whatever; and he could say that he put the questions fairly, honestly, and frankly, and did not go out of his way to compliment any party, but directed attention to what seemed to be irregularities or oversights. (e) That occurred the 2nd of July, and he would now put it to the good sense, good feeling, and gentlemanly taste of every gentleman there, was there one syllable in the letter which he wrote then that was not correct and true? And he would ask also, was there a word in it that could give offence to any gentleman except he was morbidly disposed to be offended? (f) He thought the governors of such an institution as that—gentlemen of so much intelligence and social position—were quite competent to enquire for themselves into the quality of the provisions supplied, or any irregularities in the accounts; and that it was a little too much to expect that a Commissioner of Lunatic Asylums, having many very important duties to look after, should come and see whether twopence halfpenny worth of

bread was fair value or not ; or that every ox-head was sound, and every scrap of meat was full weight or not. He thought it was the duty of the Board of Governors to enquire into these matters themselves, which they were fully competent to do ; and, if they would excuse him for saying so, it was something of an abdication of their functions not to do so. (g) He was now prepared to examine on oath every person whose testimony could throw the least light on the affair. I will now, said Dr. Nugent, read you the report which I made on that occasion—

Dublin Castle,
7th July, 1860.

With reference to the annexed letters from Mr. Wilson, one of the Governors of the Limerick District Asylum, I have the honor to state for the information of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, that I attended at the last meeting of the Board of that Institution, on the 2nd inst.,—eight members being present. It was a subject of regret that Mr. Wilson himself did not attend, either with regard to the communication addressed to the Lord Lieutenant, or the notice of a motion on another question to which his name was affixed, Mr. Wilson being at the time in England on business of private importance. (h)

I have to observe that in the opinion of the Board, on the 2nd inst., the subject matter of Mr. Wilson's letter had been already taken sufficient cognizance of by the Governors at a former meeting, as simply having a bearing on the domestic economy of the Asylum and thus not requiring any superior interference. (i)

The facts are as follows :—A Mr. Kelly for the last eight or ten years has been meat contractor to the Asylum ; he is a respectable trader, of means reputed to be very ample, and is a town councillor of Limerick. It appears that from the beginning *he* supplied (as was previously the case) the manager or resident physician with certain portions of meat at *contract* prices, the meat not being of superior quality in *itself*, but the joints better, and cut from the same animal, for the most part. As it happened that on some, but very rare occasions, (j) that portions of meat were returned to the contractor, as of a quality inferior or from having too much bone, Mr. Wilson, as a Governor, thought it his duty, and as a duty, very properly brought the subject before a Board, prior to that of the 2nd inst., when the resident physician, though repudiating the idea that he would act dishonestly or dishonorable, but at the same time upholding the privilege as one that had been adopted at all times, said he would waive the right if even he had it, and so the matter seemed to terminate *quoad* previous Boards.

On the 2nd I sent for Mr. Kelly, and questioned him before the Governors as to the facts above stated. He replied that he always, as a matter of course, supplied the resident physician with beef and mutton only, at contract prices, lamb, veal, &c. at the current cost in the market. He emphatically denied that he would be in the most remote degree influenced by the consideration of sending a few pounds of meat to the Manager at contract prices to the deprivation of the patients, either in the quantity or quality of the article he supplied, and as to what was returned he invariably had it changed. That in Summer weather no contractor could guarantee the goodness of the best meat from one day to another. He further declared that though

losing about £20 a week on the existing contract he would faithfully adhere to it. After hearing Mr. Kelly's explanation and aware of the intention of the resident physician, the Board thought it unnecessary to proceed farther, at the same time every member present felt that Mr. Wilson in bringing the question *originally* before it had adopted a very proper course. (*k*)

I have, &c. &c.,
(Signed) JOHN NUGENT.

General Sir T. Larcom, K.C.B.

Dr. Nugent.—The question first at issue was with regard to the meat; but when he (Dr. Nugent) came down it was with a view of inquiring into any charges that might affect officers holding situations in that establishment under the Lord Lieutenant, whose characters were involved in it; he came down to see how those charges affected officers in that Institution, and that did not at all affect or interfere with any other inquiry. (*l*) He regretted, however, to state that, as affecting himself—a stranger and an absent man—letters should have appeared in the papers imputing motives and assigning causes for his conduct, derogatory to the character of an honourable man. (*m*) He conscientiously differed with that Board in some matters, but he believed he always discussed his views as a gentleman should; and he would be open to every impeachment from which an honourable man would shrink, if he did not, honestly and openly, express the convictions of his own mind, however they might differ with the views and opinions of others. He had come down here now in pursuance of the authority of an Act of Parliament, and as the Board had very properly called on the Government to send down an Inspector to investigate these complaints. But what had been done behind the back of the Governors? A private gentleman wrote letters to the Lord Lieutenant to say that he (the Inspector) was not the person to investigate these complaints. He thought that was not becoming in any one to do.

Mr. Wilson.—I deny that I have done anything behind your back; or that I have done anything offensive to any man; or that I have done anything which I ought not have done. The whole correspondence was of a public and official character, and not a private one, as you would seem to insinuate.

Dr. Nugent.—Letters appeared in the public press against an absent gentleman who could not defend himself. Mr. Wilson published letters offensive to me, and undeserved on my part. The question was one which involved the character of the officers connected with the institution, and he, as a government officer, had been sent down to ascertain if those charges had any foundation—a duty which he would conscientiously discharge, for which honourable motives he was sure the Board would give him credit; but for any one to write behind the Governors' back, to call for an investigation, was not becoming of any man. (*n*)

Mr. Wilson.—I deny anything of that kind.

Dr. Nugent.—The Board of Governors have now the whole matter in their own hands, and the main question is, have the books been tampered with; and that was what the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary had directed him to come down there and enquire into; and if they had been tampered with, whoever was shown to have done so would cease to hold office in that institution.

The Mayor thought they ought to hear now what Mr. Wilson had to say.

Dr. Nugent thought they should first limit themselves to the subject of the enquiry, and after that the Board might go into any other subject they thought fit. He would examine witnesses on oath, and there would be no humbug or delay; as far as he could, he would endeavour to elicit the whole truth, and make his report upon it within forty-eight hours. (o) He had come down by the directions of Government to investigate a particular charge—

Mr. Singleton.—What charge is that?

Dr. Nugent.—The charge of tampering with the provision report book.

Mr. H. Maunsell.—One part of Mr. Wilson's charge, but which I believe he has withdrawn, was making away with a marble-coloured book.

Mr. Wilson.—No; I have withdrawn nothing.

The Mayor.—May I ask, if I might do it without offence, in what capacity does Mr. Wilson appear to-day?

Mr. Wilson.—What capacity do you look upon me as occupying here?

The Mayor.—I was going to ask, was it as prosecutor?

Mr. Wilson.—No; I declined distinctly, before the whole Board, being a prosecutor. I refused to frame a charge, but I said that if called on to give evidence I would not shrink from doing so.

Dr. Fitzgerald said that Mr. Wilson had publicly stated in the office that the clerk and storekeeper's book had been mutilated.

Mr. Wilson.—Now this is putting me upon my trial. I believe there never was a person placed in a more anomalous position than I am. I received the other day a notice that this meeting was to be held, but it did not state by what authority. I have attended here, and I think you will perceive from the report of the government officer that I am the person who is to be put on his trial, and not the officers of this establishment. Very hard language has been used against me, but I don't complain of it, as, no doubt, I have used strong language myself; but I will only ask you to give me a patient hearing, a clear stage, and no favour; none do I ask. And now, gentlemen, I request your particular, and at the same time impartial, attention to the facts which I am proceeding to detail. They may appear uninteresting, and perhaps tedious, to you, but as they relate to matters of the utmost importance concerning the proper management of this institution, they should not, in my mind, be lightly passed over; and I think I will show, before I conclude my case, that what I asked the Lord Lieutenant for, was not an inquiry with respect to scraps of meat, blue milk, and the weight of bread, but a matter of far greater importance than even their consideration. Well, now, gentlemen, as the cause of my appearance here to-day I may mention that on Tuesday, the 11th instant, I received a printed notice, signed "Robert Fitzgerald," that a special meeting of the directors would be held on Monday, the 17th instant, at twelve o'clock, to investigate on oath, certain charges preferred by me (although he distinctly heard me refuse Mr. Monsell, when he asked me to frame a charge, though ready to give evidence as to the statement I made); but when the resident physician received the order to issue this notice, or whether it emanated from Lord Lieutenant, or secretary, or inspector, or a quorum of directors, or the gentleman himself, I am left in utter ignorance; or whether I am to act the part of governor, or witness, or prosecutor, I am also left in

ignorance up to this moment. With this gentleman, who is the cause of my appearing before you, I was, until he became resident physician here, unacquainted. On renewing my attendance at the board, his manner was ever marked with the greatest possible courtesy and respect. I took a pleasure in visiting the wards in his company, and witnessing with pleasure their uniform cleanliness and order, and especially pleased with the good feeling which existed between him and the patients, and to which I never failed to bear testimony as well without as within the walls. But from the first time I, on the impulse of the moment, brought the meat contract officer under the notice of the Board, up to the present moment, I have been subjected to a course of proceeding on the part of the resident physician, which I shall not here designate as I feel it deserves, and inasmuch as I have done so in strong terms already through the press.

I shall now proceed to give a statement of facts, and to which I shall depose on oath—submitting to any examination that may be deemed necessary to elicit truth, and fearlessly courting a searching scrutiny into every act of mine connected with the affair—one in which I think it will appear, that the officials left no effort untried to defeat enquiry, and which I have endeavoured to counteract, under difficulties such as have been rarely encountered. Praying for a patient hearing, I shall now proceed with my statement.

At a meeting of the Board of the Lunatic Asylum, I think it was in the month of March last, two of the governors directed my attention to the numerous complaints against the meat contractor in the provision report-book. Mr. Hartigan was one, and Mr. Mahoney was the other. The complaints seemed so numerous that I deemed it a duty to call the attention of the Board to the subject. In the conversation that ensued, it was remarked that where so many complaints appeared, the contractor should not have got a renewal of his contract. Mr. Hartigan stated, that on the day of renewing the contract, he had distinctly asked Dr. Fitzgerald whether there were any complaints against the contractor, and that his reply was, he had performed his contract extremely well, and the complaints against him were very trifling indeed. On the next Board-day (2nd of April) the subject was again renewed by Dr. Fitzgerald stating that Mr. Kelly, the contractor, was in attendance. A long and desultory conversation ensued, in which several governors took a part—Mr. Spring Rice a prominent one—the contractor endeavouring to excuse himself from the blame which appeared to attach to him. During the discussion Mr. Spaight observed, that it was quite possible Dr. Fitzgerald's observation to Mr. Hartigan, might be consistent with the entries, as the complaints might have occurred after the contractor was declared, though before he entered on the new contract. The force of this observation struck the Board; but, on the report-book being referred to, complaints appeared before the contractor was declared, and after contract was entered on. The minute runs thus in the book :—"He (Mr. L. Kelly) appeared before the Board, and stated he was not aware there were so many complaints about the meat supplied. The storekeeper's book having, however, being referred to, the minute entered in his book by Dr. Nugent, Inspector-General, on 23rd of May, 1859, and signed by the Mayor and chairman of the Board of that day, directing him to note daily the quality of the bread, milk, and meat supplied, Resolved—That the manager be requested to countersign all reports in the storekeeper's report-book, which is to be

submitted to the monthly meeting of the Board." Dr. Fitzgerald alluded to his absence, as the cause of his ignorance of there having been so many complaints. (*p*) Mr. Kelly having laid much stress on his not being apprised of the numerous entries against him, I observed if it were the case, I thought he had strong grounds for complaint. Passing through the meat market some short time after the Board meeting, Mr. Kelly entered on the subject of the entries against him at much length, concluding by stating that the cause of them really was, his refusing to give the matron rations at contract price, and that he would bring the matter before the Governors the next Board day. I could not but agree with him that he had much to complain of, if that was the case, and that he was perfectly right in bringing such a case before the Board; and I mentioned this to Mr. Wm. Spaight, whom I met shortly after. Some days after, at the Munster Fair in April, Dr. Fitzgerald entered on the subject of the Asylum, especially the meat contract, and we spoke of it for some time; and, among other things, he endeavoured to extenuate the contractor's not supplying the number of ox-heads he was bound to. I told him what Mr. Kelly had said to me, as to his refusal to give the matron meat at the contract price, as the cause he assigned for there being so many complaints against him, at which Dr. Fitzgerald appeared much surprised, and said that Mr. Kelly should not have stated that. I said I thought him perfectly right in stating it, if it were true. He then asked me had I any objection to his speaking to Mr. Kelly, and telling him what I said. "How could I have any objection, when he has declared he will bring the matter before the Board the next Board day?" was my reply. On the next Board day, in May, I asked was Mr. Kelly in attendance, and was told not. I then asked Dr. Fitzgerald had he spoken to him on the subject of the matron, as he said he would. He replied not, that he thought it better not to do so. I then stated to the Board what Mr. Kelly had stated to me, as to the matron, and which all appeared to consider a grave matter for consideration, and led to a good deal of discussion—and, as well as my memory serves me, it was at this meeting that the matron was called in, and gave an explanation which was deemed quite satisfactory—and I thought, as I believe did all the other members of the Board, that the meat affair was at an end. A few days after, one of the governors, Mr. Hartigan, stopt me and said: "Dr. Fitzgerald has been telling me he was speaking to Kelly, and that Kelly said you had no right to mention the matter about the matron at the Board, as he told it to you in confidence; but," said Mr. Hartigan, "it would be a curious subject for confidence between a governor and a contractor." I asked if he, Mr. Kelly, denied telling me he would bring the matter before the Board. "Oh, he did not say that," said Mr. Hartigan. "Then if he does not deny that," said I, "the calumny carries its own refutation." Mr. Hartigan continued, and said that he told Dr. Fitzgerald he ought not have spoken to Mr. Kelly on the subject. I said that so far as I was concerned, I had not the slightest objection to his speaking to whom he pleased upon the subject, if the facts were fairly stated. Considering it a great hardship that a governor, for merely doing his duty, should be subjected to have his conduct misrepresented by the manager of the Institution, and his character blasted by imputations of such a nature as a breach of confidence, I caused a notice to be given that I would bring the matter connected with the meat contract before the Board at the next day of meeting, and I did so. I first went shortly over

what had occurred on the several occasions that the matter had been before the Board, and appealed to the members who had been present, whether I had not fairly stated the part I took in the transaction; and I got an unanimous assent from them. I then detailed what had occurred between the resident physician and myself at the fair of Limerick, and I asked him, had I or not stated it truly. "Perfectly so," was his reply, and I then turned to Mr. Hartigan (he had previously given me full permission to refer to what he had told me), and asked him whether I was not correct in stating, he had told me, that Dr. Fitzgerald had stated to him, I should not have alluded to the affair of the matron, as Mr. Kelly said he had told it to me in confidence. "Most certainly," was his, Mr. Hartigan's, reply. "I never told you so," exclaimed Dr. Fitzgerald "I say you did," said Mr. Hartigan. "Between you both I leave it, gentlemen, said I," and I then appealed to the Board to say, whether it was to be tolerated that the manager of the Institution, though not the originator of a calumny, should, if Mr. Hartigan's statement were true, be the propagator of one against a governor, for, as I said before, merely doing his duty. What the feelings of the governors present were on the occasion of the extraordinary scene they had witnessed, or which of the gentlemen they gave credit to, it is not for me to say. A long discussion then took place on the question of the contract, and the manner in which it was being carried on, and then came out the fact, that the resident physician was himself receiving his meat at contract price, of which I and several others of the governors, were up to that moment in entire ignorance. Dr. Fitzgerald said he understood his predecessor did the same; but Mr. Gabbett, the best authority at the Board, said he had enquired and understood it was not the case in Mr. Jackson's time. The practice was, however, I think I am justified in saying, by the unanimous voice of the Board condemned, and Dr. Fitzgerald, after some time and difficulty, reluctantly yielded to their opinion; and again I was satisfied the matter of the meat contract was set at rest. But within an hour, when passing through the meat-market, Dr. Fitzgerald, who was in Mr. Kelly's stall, addressed me in reference to the statement made by Mr. Hartigan. I endeavoured to avoid it, but he persevered in questioning Mr. Kelly as to whether he had any conversation with him on the subject, to which Mr. Kelly replied in the negative,—when Dr. Fitzgerald said, "It seems he could not have said what Mr. Hartigan stated." I said the matter had been disposed of in the Board-room, and that was no place to re-open it, and that it was not fair to me to do so in such a place; but Dr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Kelly both followed me, talking loudly, and although Dr. Fitzgerald had just admitted he ought not to have addressed me there—he wound up by asking Mr. Kelly in a loud tone, "whether he ever had told Mr. Wilson he would bring the affair with regard to the matron before the Board." "Never," said Mr. Kelly, in as loud a tone. "I never told him so." I thanked Dr. Fitzgerald for his conduct towards me, and again he said in a low tone he ought not to have addressed me. Thus the same man who, within an hour, had heard the Board bear testimony to the truthfulness of my statement to them—who heard Mr. Hartigan also admit the correctness of what I said with regard to him—who had himself borne testimony to the truth of what had passed between him and me—was the person to come forward and follow me through the public shambles, putting a question to the contractor for the purpose of eliciting an answer that went to brand me with a wilful, and

deliberate, and gratuitous falsehood, having no personal interest, and originally no personal feeling whatsoever in the matter. I should here mention that Mr. Hartigan, in order to give additional proof that the conversation took place, reminded me of his having stated he told Dr. Fitzgerald he should not have spoken to the contractor on the subject, but which I had not stated to the Board. The course thus persevered in by the resident physician towards me without the board-room it was—that determined me to apply to His Excellency for an enquiry into the entire matter, and I did so in a letter which I will now read :—

Limerick District Lunatic Asylum,
Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, Co. Clare, June 8th, 1860.

My Lord,

As a Governor of the above Institution, which has of late attracted much attention both in the Counties of Clare and Limerick, I feel called on to apprise Your Excellency, that circumstances have arisen out of discussions on the Meat Contract at the last three Meetings of the Board, so materially affecting the interests of the Institution, and involving the conduct of two of the Governors, the Resident Physician, the Matron, and Contractor, as to induce me to impress upon Your Excellency, the necessity of a searching inquiry into all matters connected with the subject; and I am the more urgent in respectfully calling Your Excellency to direct an inquiry, inasmuch as I am one of the Governors to whom I have alluded, who felt he was doing no more than his duty, and who also felt that had he failed to do what he did, he would have been guilty of a dereliction of duty, and in which he believes there was not a single Governor present, who did not coincide. (q)

I have the honor to be &c.,
D. J. WILSON.

To the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle,
Lord Lieutenant-General and General Governor of Ireland.

I received in reply the following acknowledgement :—

Dublin Castle, 12th June, 1860.

SIR,
I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, requesting that an enquiry may be instituted into certain matters connected with the meat contract for the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
THOMAS LARCOM.

To D. Wilson, Esq.,
Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, Co. Clare.

A pressing call brought me over to England on the 20th June, and on the 2nd July I addressed to the Under Secretary the following note :—

2, Henrietta-street, Bath, July 2nd, 1860.

SIR,
On the 12th of last month you, by direction of the Lord Lieutenant,

acknowledged the receipt of a letter which I had addressed to His Excellency on matters connected with the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

May I now request to know whether His Excellency has as yet come to any decision as to granting the enquiry for which I prayed.

I remain, &c. &c.,

DAVID J. WILSON.

To Major-General Larcom, &c. &c.,
The Castle, Dublin.

Receiving no reply, and having been told by a governor, Dr. Gibson, on the day I was starting, that no meeting of the Board could be held 'till the 9th, I on the 7th July wrote to the chairman the following letter, accompanied by papers which I will also submit to the Board:—

2, Henrietta-street, Bath,
7th July, 1860.

SIR,

As I cannot (as I had intended) be present at the meeting of the Governors on Monday next, when I was to have seconded Mr. Spaight's motion for the admission of the press to our meetings, I take leave to give the reasons which (could I have been present) I should have used in support of my views.

I also take leave to place before the Governors, copies of two letters which I addressed to the Government, and the letter of the Under-Secretary acknowledging the first.

The course adopted by the resident physician in addressing and following me, immediately after our last meeting, through the public shambles, from one end to the other, accompanied by the contractor for meat, and putting questions to the contractor tending to elicit a direct contradiction to statements I had just previously made to the Board, (and of the correctness of which the Board had an opportunity of judging, from the rather extraordinary scene which ensued) (*r*) it was that caused me to press for an enquiry, and being still of opinion that enquiry should be granted, as necessary to the wellbeing of the Institution, and as due to those who have taken a part, and are mixed up with the matter to which my letter referred,

I propose (in the event of the Governors as a body not calling for an investigation) that those concerned, and who are inclined to court enquiry, should join in pressing for it, which may have the effect of hastening a decision at head quarters, in the event of one not having already been come to.

I remain, Sir, your obedint Servant,

The Chairman of the Board of Governors.

DAVID J. WILSON.

Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

REASONS FOR ADMITTING THE PRESS.

1st.—Because it will be a wholesome check upon the proceedings of the Institution, whether as regards the Governors, the Officers, or the Contractors.

2nd.—Because the absence of the Press has upon more than one occasion, led to unauthorized and incorrect accounts of the proceedings of the Board.

3rd.—Because statements put forward with regard to the working and management of the Institution, have been of a most conflicting nature.

4th.—Because recent occurrences *within* the Board-room, have been alluded to in such a manner *without* the Board-room, as to render the presence of the Press absolutely necessary, as a protection against misunderstandings and misrepresentations.

5th.—Because an intimation from the Board to the members of the Press upon a recent occasion, that their presence would be acceptable, is in itself a proof that the principle is admitted.

DAVID J. WILSON.

Minute of Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, at a Meeting held Dec. 12th, 1859.

The subject relative to the admission of the press having been considered,

Resolved,—That we consider it would be highly desirable to admit the public Press on the two principal days in April and December, when the tenders are to be received for contracts, and that we recommend the Board to announce same in advertisements.

On the 19th of July, I addressed the following note to His Excellency :

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, July 19th, 1860.

My Lord,

On the 2nd instant I addressed and posted at Bath, a letter to General Larcom, of which I annex a copy.

I now take leave respectfully to apprise your Excellency, that I received no reply to my letter to General Larcom during my stay at Bath, nor did I find one here on my return last evening.

I have the honor to be, with great respect,

Your Excellency's obedient Servant,

D. J. WILSON.

To His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant,
Dublin Castle.

Under cover to the Private Secretary.

Dublin Castle, 14th July, 1860.

SIR,

Referring to your letters of the 8th ultimo and 2nd instant, relative to certain matters connected with the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit herewith copy of a Report upon the subject adverted to, which has been received from Doctor Nugent, Inspector of Lunatic Asylums. (s)

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

THOMAS A. LARCOM.

D. J. Wilson, Esq., 2, Henrietta-street, Bath.

[See Report, as read by Dr. Nugent, at page 3.]

Dublin Castle, 23rd July, 1860.

SIR,

I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of

your letter of the 19th instant, and I am desired by His Excellency to transmit herewith copy of a communication addressed to you on the 16th instant, in reply to your letter of the 2nd instant, relative to the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
THOMAS A. LARCOM.

D. J. Wilson, Esq., Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge.

On the 24th and 25th, I received the two foregoing letters, and also two copies of Dr. Nugent's Report, one having been transmitted from Bath; an underscoring in the first is omitted in the second, and a word is added to the second which did not appear in the first. (*t*) The course pursued, and the enquiry (if it could be so called), having been made behind my back, and not in my opinion adhering to facts, caused me to put forward through the press this letter:—

LIMERICK LUNATIC ASYLUM.

To the Editor of the Munster News.

Belvoir, 25th July, 1860.

SIR,

You have no doubt heard of the Irish drummer—who complained that he could not please the man he was flogging, whether he struck him high or low. I am pretty much in his position at present.

At a public meeting at Ennis, the Clare Governors of this Asylum were held up for non-attendance and neglect of their duties, and when one does attend, and endeavour to discharge his duties, *overtly within* the Board-room—an attempt is made to *covertly* calumniate him *without* the Board-room.

In consequence of this attempt having been signally defeated and exposed before a meeting of the Board—smarting under the exposure, a second attempt was, immediately after the meeting, made openly and loudly without the Board-room, and in the public market-place.

To protect myself from a repetition of such conduct, I, on the 8th of June, prayed his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant to institute an inquiry into the matter out of which it arose. My letter was acknowledged by the Under Secretary, but no intimation whatever was given, as to whether my request would be complied with.

On the 20th of June, when on my way to England, in consequence of a sudden call (as I thought, for a fortnight), I was told by an old Governor—a very constant attendant at the Board, and well acquainted with its rules and practices—that no meeting of the Board would, or *could*, be held on the usual day—the first Monday in the month; as it came so close upon the end of the previous month, the accounts could not be ready, and therefore I would be back in time for the July meeting on the 9th. (*u*) Notwithstanding this assurance, however, what was my surprise, to find on my return from England, that the Board *had* met on the *first* Monday of the month (being the 2nd instant), and that the inquiry which I prayed for, *and of which I received no notice whatever, had been held on that day.*

The report of the Inspector who held the inquiry has been forwarded to me: but as no copy of the evidence on which it is founded accompanied the report, I can form no opinion as to its bearing upon the evidence. It

does not even touch upon the matter which I considered as most material—to which, had I been present, I should have directed attention, and at which some members of the Board had expressed no small degree of surprise.

I do not hesitate to say that the report, on a portion of the matter that has been referred to by the Inspector as a *fact*—is directly at variance with opinions expressed by some of the most intelligent of the Directors, and even an admission of the Resident Physician—and I further assert that the report has, on other points, a direct tendency to mystify and mislead.

Pending any other proceedings, I studiously abstain from going into detail, and therefore trust that a report, founded on an inquiry held behind the back of the person who sought it, and of which inquiry he received no notice whatever, from Under Secretary or Inspector, either as to its being granted, or when it was to be held—(though making special application for information from the Under Secretary), will be received with all the doubt and caution which such a course of proceeding deserves—the more especially as the Report, in the face of all these facts, does seriously profess to—“*regret that Mr. Wilson himself did not attend the inquiry!*”

I remain, &c.

D. J. WILSON.

On the 22nd of August, I sent the following notice of motion to the Asylum. It contained a further notice in reference to a letter from Dr. Cullinan. And in consequence of what had previously occurred with regard to the enquiry, I sent a copy to the press on the 25th August.

NOTICE.

Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

That I will, at the next meeting of the Board, call attention to the circumstances connected with the Meat Contract, which caused me to apply to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant for an Inquiry;

To the course pursued by the Government officials, in regard to the holding of the Inquiry, and to the Report which was the result of that Inquiry;

To the fact that no copy of the Report of the Inspector of Lunatic Asylums on what purported to be an Inquiry, into matter seriously affecting the interests of the Institution, or any notice of it whatsoever, appeared on the minutes at the last monthly board day, held on the 6th instant—although the Report bears date the 7th of July, and although a meeting of the Board was held on the 13th of July;

And to the further fact, that no notice whatever appears on the minutes, in respect to communications of an official nature, forwarded by me to the Board on the 7th of July, in reference to matters connected with the Meat Contract.

D. J. WILSON.

Belvoir, 22nd August, 1860.

N.B.—For the above reasons, and inasmuch as no notice, as to the holding of the inquiry alluded to, was given to some members of the Board (who assured me they would have attended were they aware of the intention to hold it); and as none whatever was given to me, who had

applied for the inquiry, either as to when it would be held, or whether it would at all be held, I deem it necessary to give this notice through the Press.

August 25th.

D. J. WILSON.

To David J. Wilson, Esq.

Some days after the 25th I went to the Asylum to examine the minute and report books, get an extract from the former, and see how far the latter coincided with the report of the Inspector—in order to be prepared for the meeting of the 3rd of September, when my notice was, as I thought to come off; but when I came to examine the report-book handed to me by Mr. Bodkin, the same I had been in the habit of seeing at the board, I was in no slight degree surprised that the resident physician should have represented the complaints against the meat-contractor as so slight, and that the inspector appointed to report, after due enquiry and examination, should have considered and pronounced them as—*very rare*. One interlineation to an entry particularly struck me, inasmuch as a portion of it came upon the Christian name of the clerk. Two or three entries of complaints of late dates also particularly attracted my attention, as having occurred subsequent to the 2nd of July, the day on which Dr. Nugent held his enquiry, and I observed to the clerk on the circumstance of complaints so soon occurring again. His reply was, that his orders were very strict as to reporting the state of the provisions supplied. I mentioned the fact of the numerous entries, and those to which I have particularly referred, almost immediately after I had seen them. On the 30th of August the usual summons for the monthly meeting in September was issued; but it contained, as appears, no allusion whatever to the notice I had given. On the 3rd September I addressed this letter to the chairman of the day, and on the same day there was a letter from the clerk enclosing the minute of the meeting held on the 3rd September, 1860, and both of which I shall now read, and also the summons.

Limerick Lunatic Asylum,
30th August, 1860.

SIR,

I beg to acquaint you that a monthly meeting of the Board of Directors will be held here on Monday, the 3rd September next, at 12 o'Clock, to transact the ordinary business of the Institution.

Your attendance is requested.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

ROBERT FITZGERALD,
Resident Medical Officer and Manager.

Limerick Lunatic Asylum.

SIR,

I, several days before the issuing of the summons to the Governors for the meeting of to-day, and before it appeared in the papers, forwarded to the resident physician the original of the inclosed notice. As no allusion to it appears in the summons, and as a Governor has informed

me the resident physician gave as a reason for the omission, that he had received no notice, (although duly posted) it would be competent to any Governor to object to my going into the matter to which it refers.

Under these circumstances, I shall absent myself from the meeting of to-day, leaving the Governors who may be present to deal with as many of the facts adverted to in the accompanying papers (which I inclose) as they shall find borne out by minutes; reserving to myself the power to deal with the entire case hereafter, in such manner as I may be advised. Protesting in the strongest manner against the course pursued by the Under-Secretary, the Inspector, and the resident Physician,

I have the honor to be, &c.

D. J. WILSON.

Belvoir, Sept. 3rd, 1860.

To the Chairman of the Board of Governors.

Limerick District Lunatic Asylum,
Limerick, 3rd Sept. 1860.

SIR,

I am directed to transmit you copy of minutes adopted at a monthly meeting of the Board of Governors of this Institution, at their monthly meeting held this day, referring to notice of motion dated 22nd August, 1860, and to your letter of the present date, which I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

JAMES BODKIN, *Clerk and Store Keeper.*

To David J. Wilson, Esq.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge.

Minute of Proceedings of the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, at Monthly Meeting held 3rd September, 1860; present:—William Fitzgerald, Esq., Mayor, Chairman; William Hartigan, Esq.; Michael R. Ryan, Esq.

Having read a letter from David J. Wilson, Esq. relative to his notice of motion of 22nd August, 1860, ordered that Mr. Wilson be informed that his notice of motion will be duly recorded on the minutes of the Board, and a printed copy of same will be transmitted with the circular for next monthly meeting, when the subject will be submitted for consideration.

On the 21st September I addressed this letter to the late lamented Mayor:—

Jermyn-street, London,
Sept. 21st, 1860.

Dear Mr. Mayor,

There has been forwarded to me here a copy of a minute made at the last meeting of the Governors of the Asylum, at which you appear to have presided and which orders:—

That my notice of motion of the 22nd of August, 1860, be duly recorded on the minutes of the Board, and a printed copy of same trans-

mitted with the circular for the next monthly meeting, when the subject will be submitted for consideration.

It is gratifying to find, even at the eleventh hour, a Board Meeting of opinion that attempts to gloss over matters seriously affecting the character of individuals connected with the Institution, and the interests of the inmates, should be no longer permitted. Whether contractor, officer, governor, or inspector, let the saddle be put on the right horse, after *full* and *fair* enquiry.

I was as fully prepared to have gone into all the matters connected with the subject of my notice at the last meeting of the Board, had it been circulated in the usual form, as I was to have met the original enquiry which I sought for. One was held, and *without notice* during my *absence*. The other was *evaded* while I was *present*. (v)

Under these circumstances, I have, after further consideration, decided to abstain from putting myself forward as an accuser; for, with officials apparently—if not absolutely—determined to cushion and protect,—I feel there would be nothing for me to, expect either in the way of redress—or of censure—even though proofs of the facts I have alluded to, should be established; and the absence of the Press would be a bar to their publicity. While determined to pursue my own course, with regard to the imputations sought to be fixed on myself, it is not for a moment to be supposed I shrink from coming forward to substantiate every fact which I have put forth through the Press; (and which in my opinion seriously affect the interests of the Institution) should I be called on by the Board to do so; and while I state this, I also state, not inadvertently or idly, but deliberately, that the worst remains to be told. (w) Leaving the Governors to act as to them may seem proper,

I remain, dear Mr. Mayor, with great respect,
Yours faithfully,

DAVID J. WILSON.

To Wm. Fitzgerald, Esq., Mayor of Limerick.
Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

Mr. Wilson proceeded to observe:—On the — of October I visited the Asylum for the purpose of copying the several entries in the report book with regard to the meat contract, but finding neither physician nor clerk in attendance, I refrained from doing so; I did not even look at any of the books on that day. On the 6th of October I again went to the Asylum, found the clerk there, and was handed the present book as the report book, which my impression was, and is, I never saw before. I proceeded to copy all entries relative to the meat contract, which struck me as not being as numerous as when I had seen them in August. I was momentarily expecting to come to the interlineation I have referred to, but it did not turn up; and at last I came to the month of June, 1860, and to my utter astonishment did not find the entries for July and August, which I had seen in the last week of August. I questioned Mr. Bodkin on the subject—expressed my surprise—asked for another book—there was no other book, he said. I alluded to the entries to which I had pointed his attention subsequent to the 2nd of July; he appeared confused—could give no account of them; and yet nothing had been done to the book. I alluded to the interlineation, which I could not find. He asked the date of it; but I

could give him no information on that score. I persisted in stating that the report book then produced was not the same, or if the same, not in the same state as when shown to me in August. Mr. Bodkin was confused, made attempts to explain, but could not get over the non-appearance of the entries subsequent to the 2nd of July. Dr. Fitzgerald, I should have mentioned, had entered the office when I had nearly finished making my extracts. During my observations to Mr. Bodkin, Dr. Fitzgerald, whom I supposed would have been anxious to clear up matters, or repudiate the idea of the book being tampered with, listened attentively, but never made the slightest observation. On the 5th of November I, at the meeting of the Board, stated what had occurred with regard to the non-appearance of the entries I had seen when I examined the book in August, and in distinct terms asked Mr. Bodkin whether I did not point out to him the entries of complaints against the meat contractor, as coming very soon after the enquiry on the 2nd of July? He unhesitatingly admitted that I had done so; and when I asked whether he did not reply to me that his orders were very strict with regard to entries as to the provisions, he as unhesitatingly admitted that it was his reply; but still, on the book being referred to, no entry appeared. This state of things so completely appeared to puzzle the governors, that they deemed enquiry necessary; but as I refused to give evidence, except on oath, and as it appeared doubtful whether the Board possessed the power of administering one, it was decided to apply for an enquiry to his Excellency; but I distinctly refused, when applied to, to put forward any charge as a prosecutor,—from the course pursued throughout the matter by the Government officials,—but ready to give evidence if called on. At this meeting I put into the hands of the Governors present at Dr. Nugent's enquiry, on the 2nd of July, his report, and which they then saw for the first time. The result appears in the following letter to his Excellency:—

Belvoir, November 7th, 1860.

My Lord,

I was induced, in consequence of the rather unprecedented course adopted on a late occasion by one of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, in reference to what purported to be an enquiry which he made on the 2nd of July last, into matters connected with the meat contract for this Asylum, to address a circular to the several Governors who were present on that day.

The report of the Inspector upon this enquiry tending to convey, both directly and by implication, that it had been coincided in by all the Governors present; I deemed it but fair, as the report in my opinion does not adhere to facts, and as it, to use the Inspector's own words, in his strictures on the report of the Commissioners on Lunatic Asylums, "has the appearance of being one-sided," to give those Governors an opportunity of stating whether they adopted, or dissented from it.

The Chairman of the meeting of the 2nd of July by letter declared "he was ignorant of being identified with the report, which was not then prepared, nor, that he was aware of, ever subsequently submitted to the Board," and all the other Governors present at the Monthly

Meeting on Monday last, who were present on the 2nd of July, after seeing the report, and for the first time, when produced by me, unhesitatingly expressed their dissent from it.

Two of the most valuable Directors could give no reply; one, the amiable and excellent Mayor was no more; the other, the upright and vigilant comptroller of the expenditure, the mainstay of the institution, Mr. Gabbett of Caherline, on his death-bed.

Your Excellency is not for a moment to suppose, I seek or expect any redress whatsoever; the course pursued towards me precluding any such hope.

My only object in now addressing your Lordship being to shew, that pending an application from the Governors for an enquiry, I have lost no time in putting your Excellency in possession of the foregoing facts.

I have the honor to be

Your Excellency's
Obedient and humble Servant,
DAVID WILSON.

To Rt. Hon. the Earl of Carlisle, &c. &c.,
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

An application from the Inspectors that I should give them an insight into my proofs, and my reply, were as follows:—

Office of Lunatic Asylums,
Dublin Castle,
7th November, 1860.

SIR,

In consequence of a resolution of the Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, dated 5th inst., requesting the Inspectors to investigate, on oath, the particulars of a statement made by you at their last meeting, involving a charge against some person in the establishment, of having tampered with the provision report book, and abstracted a certain number of reports, I am directed by the Inspectors to state that they will take it as a favor if you will have the kindness to furnish them with a copy of the statement in question, if originally made in writing; or if simply oral, that you will transmit to them the details submitted by you to the Board, in order that they may have certain data to guide them in carrying out the wishes of the Governors, as expressed in the resolution referred to.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
W. M. HENNESSY.

David J. Wilson, J.P.,
Belvoir.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge,
Friday, Nov. 9th, 1860.

SIR,

I am this morning in receipt of your letter of the 7th inst., in which you refer to "a resolution of the Governors of the Limerick District

Lunatic Asylum, requesting the Inspectors to investigate, on oath, the particulars of a statement made by me, at their last meeting, involving a charge against some person in the establishment of having tampered with the provision report book, and abstracted a certain number of reports."

Whether the abstractions were made by a person, or persons, within or without the establishment, I did not presume to say. I only spoke as to the fact.

I understood the application for enquiry was to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, not to the Inspectors; and so satisfied was I upon this point, that I yesterday made a communication to His Excellency bearing on the subject, least His Excellency might inadvertently nominate either of the Inspectors to hold the enquiry; and I did so inasmuch as I consider the report book (even in its present apparently perfect, but, on inspection, glaringly mutilated state) goes far to impeach the mode in which one of the Inspectors in this case discharged, to use his own term, a "judicial" portion of his duties.

The Inspectors request of me information "that they may have certain data to guide them in carrying out the wishes of the Governors." (x) I have already freely answered the Governors every question that they put to me; but I refrained from giving further information unless upon oath. To that I adhere.

The Inspectors state that they will consider it a favor or kindness if I will grant them information which they name. That the Inspector referred to in the enclosed letter, (y) of which I forwarded copies to His Excellency, the Chief Secretary, the Under-Secretary, and the Inspector, should seek favor or kindness from the writer, does to the writer appear as rather extraordinary.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
(Signed) DAVID J. WILSON.

Wm. Hennessy, Esq.,
Lunatic Asylums' Office,
Dublin Castle.

A telegram having called me to England, I showed it to the Under-Secretary on my way, and left a sick relative and friend, to be present at the meeting of the 3rd inst. When the question of the meat contract came on, I placed before the Board a printed list of the complaints with regard to the meat contract, and stated that I was ready to adhere to my former undertakings, but in open court, as in the Maryborough investigation. And now, gentlemen, I ask you to say if the humblest turnkey in this establishment had called for, sought for, and finally prayed for an inquiry into all those circumstances, would he be put to all these roundabouts, all this correspondence, and all the trouble and uneasiness to obtain it, that I have been put to? And if it so happened that most important and personal private business prevented his appearance on the day when the investigation which he had in a manner forced on was to be held, would it be called on in his absence and carried on behind his back?

Mr. Singleton—There was no letter here informing us of the cause of your absence.

Mr. Wilson—Oh! Mr. Singleton, I have Dr. Nugent's report here,

stating that I was away on important business, but nevertheless the inquiry went on behind my back.

Dr. Nugent—I have done as a brother governor would do, and as one governor should do to another. If I found his name on the books signifying that he had a motion to bring on, or an enquiry to make, and that he had not the courtesy to tell his brother governors that he could not attend, then I must have proceeded in his absence.

Mr. Wilson—Very courteous! particularly when you state in your report that “Mr. Wilson was absent on important business;” but had Mr. Wilson received intimation of the inquiry, and did not excuse himself, then I admit that Mr. Wilson might be treated with discourtesy and left without reason to complain. (z)

Dr. Fitzgerald—Mr. Wilson did not show me courtesy.

Mr. Wilson—I protest against those interruptions, and whilst I do so, I must observe that in prosecuting what I conceived to be just towards the public and the most afflicted of God’s creatures, I do not think that I should occupy myself with bandying compliments, and, besides all that, I have a clever man opposed to me.

Dr. Nugent—I am not opposed to you.

Mr. Wilson—It would be very unjust if you were. I am here looking for justice for this establishment, which costs the two counties so much, and also for its afflicted inmates, and it would be a cruel thing for anyone to object to inquiry; and while this episode in the proceedings has occurred, I will read this letter which I now hold in my hand, and which I received from a gentleman of clear head, of sound heart, of intelligence, and of business habits, and I am exceedingly sorry that he is not here to-day. This letter will, however, speak for itself and for its writer:—

Mount Trenchard, Foynes, August 5th, 1860.

My Dear Sir,—I am glad you have given me an opportunity of putting in writing the fact that I was one of the governors present when you brought before the Board at the Lunatic Asylum the complaints entered against the meat contractor—that I thought you not only justified, but called on to make the remarks you did upon the report-book coming under your notice—that the spirit and manner of the contractor in giving his answers were so extremely improper, that I felt it my duty to reprove and check him.

Of subsequent proceedings only known to me by conversation, I will only say that, had I been aware of any charge against you, or even any more investigation was coming forward on the question, I should at any amount of inconvenience have attended; but I was not aware that such a thing was to be expected.

I return, with many thanks, Dr. Nugent’s report. I observe with regret that he expressed no disapprobation of the highly blameable practice discovered. It is in my judgment deserving of the highest censure that the confidential servant of the governors, Dr. Fitzgerald, should have received accommodation from one of the contractors, whose proceedings it was his duty to control.

Yours very truly,
STEPHEN SPRING RICE.

D. J. Wilson, Esq.

Mr. Wilson—Now, gentlemen, before I proceed further I call on you to go over this report-book with me.

Dr. Nugent—We lose so much time.

Mr. Wilson—I have my character at stake, sir ; and I call upon you, a government officer, who is paid by the public for your time, to go over this report-book with me, and see whether or not, in copying out those extracts, I have acted like a gentleman, by making them truly and fairly, or that I am guilty of the charge made against me by the resident physician (Doctor Fitzgerald) of not copying them accurately ; and I can tell you that if you were to stay here for a week, you will have to go over that book with me, and then the result will show whether the Inspector has made his report fairly or not. I don't mean officially, but I mean whether he has made it truthfully or not ; and now you'll go, if you please, to this notable report-book, and I ask you to refer to January 17th, '59, when the entries which I have abstracted commence, and which I will read for you, you comparing them with me as I proceed.

Mr. Wilson here read the following entries, whilst Dr. Nugent and Mr. Singleton went over the report-book.

Jan. 17th, 1859.—A portion of the beef supplied on this day was quite musty and of bad quality, and not according to contract.

Mr. Wilson—Now the reason why I go so far back, as Mr. Kelly has said, is this. You will bear in mind, gentlemen, that when the contract was about entering into, in 1860, the inspector gave a good character to the contractor for the careful and truthful manner in which he performed his contract, and as if there were no complaints against him ; and now, Mr. Singleton, you have the report-book, and I pray you to hold it whilst I go over these entries with you.

Mr. Wilson then went on reading the entries.

Jan. 24th.—34lbs. of the beef supplied by the contractor on this day had to be returned, not being of good quality.

March 1st.—The beef supplied on this day was not according to contract, the greater part of it being coarse, part of the neck and shanks, and not the round half-quarter and cross cuts as required.

March 5th.—The contractor supplied only 7 ox-heads this day, instead of 9.

Dr. Nugent—I will mark that, because it is a questionable circumstance ; because he always gave meat when he did not give ox-heads.

Mr. Wilson—There is nothing in that entry, Dr. Nugent to warrant you in saying that he always gave meat when he did not give ox-heads.

May 26th.—There was too great a proportion of bone in the beef supplied by the contractor on this day, as he sent 4 shanks and 2 pieces of the neck, with some smaller pieces of scraps, instead of round half-quarters and cross cuts, which he is required by his contract to supply. About 15lbs. of mutton has been supplied.

Dr. Nugent—Was the mutton to supply weight ?

Mayor—We are only now testing the accuracy of Mr. Wilson's extracts.

May 28th.—The contractor supplied only 6 ox-heads instead of 9, and gave 21lbs. of beef instead.

June 4th.—Eight ox heads supplied to-day; 7lb. of beef instead of the one short of the number.

June 11th.—The contractor having supplied only 5 ox-heads and 28lb. of beef to-day, there was not a sufficient quantity for the female patients.

June 14th.—14lbs. of the beef supplied on this day had to be returned to the contractor, as being of bad quality; but the contractor subsequently sent an equivalent quantity of good beef.

June 18th.—The contractor having supplied only 4 ox heads and 35lbs. of beef on this day, the cook finds it most difficult to divide so small a portion of meat when boiled among so large a number of patients as 335.

June 28th.—The meat supplied this day was of a very indifferent quality.

July 6th.—5lbs. of the mutton supplied this day was returned to the contractor, as it was too stale to keep for to-morrow's use.

July 21st.—The beef supplied on this day and on the 20th inst. was not of good quality. It was small and badly

Mr. Singleton—The entry relates to bread. The bread supplied this day—

Mr. Wilson—Well, I read it 'beef.'

Mr. Singleton—This entry speaks well for the vigilance of Mr. Bodkin.

July 30th—The contractor supplied only 4 ox-heads and 35lbs. of beef on this day, and the soup was weak in consequence.

August 13th.—The quality of the beef supplied on this day was very indifferent; and 12lbs. had to be returned to the contractor, it was so bad.

August 17th.—The contractor for meat supplied only one cross cut and one round half-quarter of beef on this day, with a quarter of mutton that appeared to be good. The remainder of the beef appeared to have been killed for some time, and contained too large a proportion of bone, and was made up of scraps and coarse parts.

August 18th.—13lbs. of the meat supplied yesterday was returned to the contractor as being of bad quality, and the same quantity of good beef supplied.

August 29th.—The quality of the beef supplied on this day appeared good, but the contractor did not supply more than one cross cut of beef, and two small round half quarters. The remainder, with the exception of 19lb. of mutton, being made up of scraps of meat, and a large proportion of bone.

Mr. Wilson—From August 29th until November 12th I do not find an entry, when the following appears :—

November 12th.—The contractor having sent only three ox heads on this day, instead of nine, and 12lbs. of beef, there was not a sufficient quantity to make soup for the large number of 352 patients at present in the house.

November 28th.—A quantity of the beef had to be returned to the contractor this day, by order of the manager, being of inferior quality.

December 10th.—The contractor sent only seven ox heads on this day, for 362 patients' dinner, and 35lbs. of beef, of which 13lbs. had to be returned, it was so coarse and bad. Twelve heads is the least that should be supplied to so many patients.

December 19th.—All the beef and mutton supplied this day was not according to contract, as the contractor sent the ends, which have too great a proportion of bone, instead of sending the round half quarters entire; and the weight was this day made up with a coarse piece of beef near the neck, and a portion of a fore quarter of mutton, which was mostly bone, as the shoulder was cut off, and not sent.

December 21st.—The contractor has not supplied as much as one round half quarter of beef, out of 279lbs. delivered on this day, although bound to do so by his contract. The weight was made up of several bony and coarse pieces of beef, and the cook complains that there does not be as much meat for the patients' dinner, as when the round half quarters are supplied.

December 24th.—The meat contractor has not supplied as much as one ox head on this day for the patients' dinner, but sent a small quantity of beef instead, which is not at all sufficient to make soup for the large number of 365.

December 27th.—The meat supplied this day was of bad quality, and the contractor having sent only one lean cross cut, with two shanks of beef, and a coarse piece of the neck to make up the weight, 23lbs. had to be returned.

Mr. Mahony—That ends 1859.

Mr. Wilson—Yes; but your resident physician having stated that the contractor having fulfilled his contract satisfactorily, he was again declared contractor.

January 4th, 1860.—The meat contractor has not supplied any round half quarters of beef on this day, although required by his contract to do so.

January 6th.—Only nine ox heads supplied this day, and the contractor did not send any round half quarters of beef.

January 11th.—Returned 41lbs. of beef to the contractor, the same being of inferior quality. The quantity of good beef was subsequently supplied.

Mr. Singleton—That matter appears to be inserted subsequently.


Mr. Bodkin—That is a matter for explanation in the course of the evidence.

Mr. Singleton—The qualification clause, if I may call it, looks odd.

Mr. Wilson—That is not a matter of importance; I, however, call on you to mark it.

January 31st.—The beef supplied this day was remarkably good, but the contractor sent no mutton.

February 21st.—10lb. of beef returned to the contractor, same not being of good quality.

 The patients' dinner cannot be cooked at the proper time on Mondays and Tuesdays, in consequence of the meat contractor not supplying the beef before 11 o'clock, and sometimes later on those days, and therefore the storekeeper cannot see the meat weighed. It should be delivered at 9 o'clock, before he goes to breakfast. (aa)

Mr. Wilson—Now, gentlemen, you see that the meat contractor does not supply the beef as he agreed to do, but makes up the weight by scraps of the neck and other coarse parts. Well, again :—

April 1st.—The patients were short of their allowance of meat in No. 1, 2, 3, male side, on Sunday, in consequence of the contractor not having supplied round half quarters of beef, but a too large proportion of bone.

Mr. Wilson—Gentlemen, was that a performance of duty by the contractor? There was no complaint, because those who would complain would be considered lunatics indeed. The poor creatures were left without their dinners on that Sunday by the non-fulfilment of the contract by the man who had so truthfully performed it, according to the statement of the resident physician.

April 17th.—The contractor did not supply the meat until half past 10 o'clock on this day, although I waited until 10 o'clock to see it weighed, and have to say it should be delivered at 9 o'clock, a.m. on Mondays and Tuesdays, in order to afford sufficient time for being cooked and served to the patients by 2 o'clock, same as on Thursday and Sunday.

May 5th.—The contractor supplied only 10 ox heads, instead of 12, the number required on this day.

May 19th.—The contractor sent only 8 ox heads on this day, and 21lbs. of beef.

May 21st.—The contractor not having complied with the order of the board of the 16th of April, the storekeeper cannot see the meat weighed on Mondays and Tuesdays, as it is not supplied at the hour required.

The contractor supplied but 2 ox heads this day; sent beef instead of 10 heads.

June 12th.—The beef was cut up without being weighed when the storekeeper returned at half past 10 o'clock on this day.

Mr. Singleton—I see an entry here extending the time for the delivery of the meat by the contractor from 9 to half-past 10 o'clock.

Mr. Kelly—Yes, on my representation; and with respect to the ox heads, I sent all I could get for love or money, and very often as many as were killed in Limerick. (bb)

Mr. Wilson—Now gentlemen, take this with you; it is no answer to me to say that there were no complaints made because there were none entered in this report book, for here you have them in abundance.

Mr. Maunsell—How often does the meat come in?

Dr. Fitzgerald—Four times a week.

Mr. Maunsell—There is no eulogy on the contractor in that book at all.

Mr. Wilson—Certainly not; it was not intended for that purpose. But now, having gone through that book, I put it to you, gentlemen, to say whether or not I have made the extracts fairly and honestly, or falsely. I am sure you must say I have done so fairly, because there is not the slightest discrepancy between my extracts and the entries in that book. When I subsequently looked at that book in October, I found there were no entries in it for July or August, or September, and I asked where were they; but there were entries for July and August when I examined it in the last week of August.

Mr. Maunsell—Have you extracts of them?

Mr. Wilson—No; I have not; I wish I had.

Dr. Fitzgerald—And why did you not take them?

Mr. Wilson—It was on the 6th October I took the extracts; they were not then in the book, although I saw them in it in August.

Mayor—When he copied the entries, those entries which he has seen and read were not then there; that is the point.

Mr. Maunsell—I never knew that the book was in existence; and I think Mr. Kelly ought to get copies of the entries made in it when they are against him.

Mr. Wilson—As a director of the asylum, you ought to be aware of the existence of this book. It does not augur well for the prosperity of an establishment, when one of its directors acknowledges his ignorance of a most important book; but I agree with you, Mr. Maunsell, that Mr. Kelly ought to have copies of all those entries against him. And having now closed my case, so far as my statement goes, I have now my depositions in my hand, and I will submit them to you on my oath, and you will, of course,—nay, you must,—receive them.

Dr. Nugent—There are magistrates here, and I don't precisely know how to act. We are assembled here, it is true, to receive and to consider facts; but whether or not we can receive gratuitous information or depositions, is a question on which I would like to be informed. (cc) However, there are magistrates here, and I put myself into their (position) hands.

Mr. Wilson—The meeting here to-day is because I refused to make a statement except on oath. So now take my depositions and if I swear wrongfully, prosecute me for perjury, or refuse to take them at your—will. You are here, sir, to take an enquiry, and not to place obstacles in the way of one.

Mr. Boyse—The proper way would be to swear Mr. Wilson before he hands in what he has prepared to swear to.

Mr. Mahony—The proper person to tender the oath is the Inspector.

Dr. Nugent—I will, as Mr. Boyse suggests, swear you, Mr. Wilson, before you make your depositions.

Dr. Nugent here swore Mr. Wilson, who then proceeded to read his depositions. In the meantime Dr. Nugent left the table, and went to the fire, where he listened.

Mr. Wilson—Gentlemen, the Inspector seems to think that I am tedious; however, I'll proceed.

Mr. Wilson then went on, and read the following depositions:—

Deposition of David John Wilson, of Belvoir, in the County of Clare, who, being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists, maketh oath and saith :—

That, in consequence of a report of one of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, of an enquiry held on the 2nd of July, not adhering, in my opinion, to facts, and which report bears date the 7th of July, 1860, I gave notice on the 22nd of August I would bring the several matters connected with the report before the Board at their next meeting. That, with a view to be prepared to do so, I, on or about the 29th of August, visited the Asylum for the purpose of inspecting the minute book of proceedings and the provision report book. That the number of entries of complaints against the meat contractor were far more numerous than I expected to have found them. That one entry previous to the 2nd of July particularly struck me, as there was an interlineation stating that meat was returned by direction of the resident physician, and which interlineation came over the christian name of the clerk. That two other entries of complaints particularly struck me, as having occurred subsequent to the time of the enquiry, viz. the 2nd of July. That I pointed the attention of the clerk to those entries, observing that they came very soon after the enquiry. That the clerk's reply to me was, "My orders as to entries respecting the quality of the provisions are very strict, Mr. Wilson."—I do positively swear that upon this occasion I made no observation whatsoever to the clerk with respect to the interlineation entry; and I do further swear, that, my notice of the 22nd of August not having been inserted in the usual summons calling the meeting for September, I decided on seeking redress through another channel, and of which I apprised the chairman by letter on the 3rd and 21st of September. That correct copies of the several complaints with regard to the meat contract being necessary to sustain my case, I on the 6th of October proceeded to the Asylum for the purpose of obtaining them. (*dd*) That I was handed a book as the provision report book, which my impression was, and is, I never saw before. That I proceeded to make the extracts of the entries which I required. That I did not find the interlineation entry to which I have referred. That I did not find the two or three entries of complaints subsequent to the 2nd of July, to which I have already referred. That I did, on this occasion, allude to the interlineation entry; and I do solemnly swear, that the only observation the clerk made in regard to it was, to ask me the date of it, and which I said I was unable to give him. That with regard to the absence of the entries subsequent to the 2nd of July, and to which I had directed his attention, the clerk appeared confused, and could, or did, give no account whatsoever, though stating no entries had been removed. That I called for the report book in which I had previously seen the entries; but there was no other book to be produced. That the resident physician, who was present, offered no explanation whatsoever. That at the meeting of the Board in November, I deemed it right to put it in possession of what had occurred. That I then, in presence of the Board, distinctly repeated the fact of my having called the clerk's attention in the latter end of August to two or three entries of complaints with regard to the meat contract, and which appeared in the book then handed to me, as being entered subsequent to the 2nd of July. That I repeated the observation made to him as to its

being very soon for those complaints to appear after the enquiry. That I also repeated to him the observation which he made in return, viz., that his orders with regard to the entries of the quality of the provisions were very strict. And I further swear that, on my appealing to the clerk in the presence of the Board as to the correctness of my statement, he unhesitatingly admitted it. That under those circumstances, with my own positive ocular demonstration, corroborated by the admission of the clerk in presence of the Board, as to those particular entries, and further corroborated by the facts of the absence of any entries with regard to meat, or milk, or bread for weeks and months consecutively, in direct violation of the order of the Inspector,—I have no hesitation in swearing whether the entries and reports, formerly stood in a thin book, unbound, and with a marble cover—or in a thick book and bound, and in a parchment cover—whether so much of the entries as remain on the entire book has been re-bound in staves of single, or double sheets—whether they have been re-written—whether the present book which contains them appears, or is actually in an unmutilated state, and may be sworn to as such—I do not, as I said, hesitate to swear—that the entries and reports of the provisions supplied to the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum for the years 1859 and 1860, under the circumstances, in my mind present a glaringly mutilated state. And I further swear that, in making the extracts from the entries as they stood on the 6th of October, and which I laid before the Board at the last meeting, I made them without any intent to mystify or mislead, although charged by the resident physician with wilful omissions; and upon this score I challenge enquiry by a comparison of the extracts which I made with the book, as it now stands.

D. J. WILSON.

Sworn before me this 17th day of December, 1860.

JOHN THOMAS M'SHEEHY, Mayor of Limerick.

Mr. Wilson, having read his depositions, handed them in, and at the same time observed,—during the reading of those extracts which he had taken, as the Board might perceive, from the provision report book, and which he had accurately extracted, he had to call the attention of Dr. Nugent to them, especially to those where it appeared good meat had been returned to the hospital instead of that sent back to the contractor; and he did so with the view of showing the Board that he had not omitted them, as he was accused of doing by the resident physician—wrongfully as they now perceived; and he had also directed their attention in the same manner and with the same view to those entries, by which it appeared that the patients had not had a sufficient supply of meat and soup.

Dr. Nugent—All the extracts which you have taken have been accurately extracted; but do you, Mr. Wilson, consider in what part of the book the passages or extracts to which you allude were, and which you say were extracted?

Mr. Wilson—My impression is that nothing was taken out of this book as it now stands; but in the book presented to me there were entries complaining of the meat contractor that are not now to be found in this book, and that I swear to, clearly as the sun at noon-day.

Dr. Nugent—Then you swear positively that this is not the book in which the entries were made?

Mr. Wilson—I swear, sir, that there are not those entries in this book, which were in the book then presented to me.

Dr. Nugent—Were any of the entries in this book, in that book which was presented to you, or do you believe there is a duplicate book kept here, and from which those entries of which you speak were kept out?

Mr. Wilson—I can't swear to that. I saw these matters in the latter end of August, and I directed the clerk's attention to them, in terms, and I now ask where are they in any book?

Dr. Nugent—How many entries were there then, that are not here now?

Mr. Wilson—I have a distinct recollection of two, but I believe there were three. I have also a distinct recollection of another which had been written over the Christian name of the clerk. I have a reason—

Dr. Nugent—We are not to have reasons, we are to have facts.

The Mayor—Oh, Mr. Wilson has a right to give his reasons for recollecting those matters.

Mr. Wilson—When I arrived at home I mentioned having seen those entries, and that fact leaves no doubt on my mind whatever about them.

Dr. Nugent—Were those reports or entries that you read, and which you say are not forthcoming, adverse or favourable to the contractor?

Mr. Wilson—The two after July were adverse, and the other was favourable to the contractor, inasmuch as it stated that good meat was sent to replace that which was objected to and returned.

Dr. Nugent—How can you reconcile yourself to the fact, after the numerous complaints which are against the contractor, of the store-keeper having an object in suppressing those entries? Or do you only argue from the fact that here is a man making complaints who had no reason to do so? There are no entries when the meat sent in was good. (ee)

Mr. Wilson—I can't speak as to the objects, or motives, or influences; but I have been thinking over it, and so have others. The book which I saw was, as I recollect, an unbound book, in a marble cover, with about a quire or a quire and a half of paper in it; and if bound in what is called staves, if you cut out two leaves, the corresponding leaves must also come out; whereas, if bound in sheets, the sheet can be extracted. Dr. Nugent has asked me what object a man could have in taking out a few entries, when there were so many adverse to the contractors? I can't answer, as I have said, for motives; but if a man found that some of the entries which he had made were objectionable, and wished to take them out, and did so, he would have, while taking out the leaves on which they were written, to go back towards the end of the book, and there take out the corresponding ones.

Mr. Singleton—What object—

Mr. Wilson—I can't speak, as I have repeated, about objects or motives. I can only speak to what I saw.

Dr. Fitzgerald—Mr. Wilson was asked on the last Board day was that the book; and he said that it was a portion of it.

Mr. Wilson—No; but that the entries there were only a portion of the entries.

Mr. Singleton—What object could there be in the abstracting of two or three entries which must have been made so shortly after the enquiry?

Mr. Wilson—With objects or motives I have nothing to do, and can't speak upon them; I can only speak as to facts.

Dr. Nugent—Here I find the 28th of May upon one page, and the 11th of June on the next; and then comes the 14th of June, which is only a space of three days; then the 12th of June, and then we have no more. (#)

Mr. Maunsell—I was chairman on a former day, when Mr. Wilson said that those entries were in a marble-coloured book, and he subsequently said that he withdrew that.

Mr. Wilson—Pardon me, Mr. Maunsell; you are under a complete mistake. I clearly said no such thing, and I withdraw nothing.

Mr. John M'Kern, sworn and examined by Dr. Nugent :—You are a printer, bookseller, and stationer? A.—yes,—(Mr. M'Kern was here handed the provision report-book). Was that book bought from you?—Yes. You are in the book trade, and, I presume, you understand book-binding?—Yes; in all its details. Have you examined that book?—I have. Now state to the Board was that book ever tampered with?—I believe it was not; I have examined it, and I do not find that there was a leaf put into it, nor was there one taken out of it; I looked among my stock, and I found one like it—a twin book—and I counted the leaves in it, and I find the same number exactly in this. Does this institution purchase books from you?—Yes. Have you any recollection of sending books like that to this establishment?—Yes; but Mr. Wilson has not given me a description of the book; had he done so, it would be easy for me to look through my books, and then I would have reason to come to a conclusion. Have you sent in unbound books here?—I think not; I don't recollect that I have. Have you sent in a book with a marble cover?—No. Well, now, does that book (the provision report-book) which you hold in your hand present any appearance of being tampered with?—No; it does not.

Mr. Bodkin sworn and examined by Dr. Nugent : What situation do you hold in this establishment?—I am clerk and storekeeper these eight years, and keep the books of the establishment—and I make entries of every article that is brought in or out of the Institution; I have read the memorandum made by you in this book, and dated the 23rd of May, 1859—that memorandum is to this effect: that “the clerk and storekeeper shall daily enter the bread and meat supplied to the institution, and when bad or objected to, shall enter same, and shall get them elsewhere, and charge the contractor with an equivalent;” and since that entry was made, I kept that book and made those entries.

The Mayor—Is there anyone appointed to take down the evidence, for I can't see how a report can be drawn up in a satisfactory mode, unless the evidence is taken. If I were conducting an enquiry, I would either take down the evidence, or have it taken down as the foundation of my report. I merely ask this question, as it is an investigation on oath.

Mr. Mahony—The Press is here.

Dr. Nugent—And when you found articles of bad or injurious qualities did you make entries of the fact, or did you not?—I did so, and without fear, favour, or affection of any kind or for anyone. On your solemn oath have you any other book in which you enter these complaints but this

one?—No. On your oath do you enter in any other books any entries as to these articles primarily?—No; that is the only one. Have you heard Mr. Wilson say that there was a book in this establishment in which the complaints referred to by him were entered? There is no other book. And could you swear that no other book could be kept without your knowledge? Certainly I could. Who keeps the books of this institution? All the books of the establishment are entrusted to me and to me alone. Did you at any time produce to Mr. Wilson, when Mr. Wilson called to examine the books either directly or indirectly, any books having reference to the provisions brought to this establishment. Did you produce to him any book but this?—Yes; I showed him the provision book, but there are no complaints in it. I could not show him any other book.

Mr. Mahony—You heard Mr. Wilson say that he has a distinct recollection of seeing entries after the second of July, which were adverse to the contractor, but which entries are not now to be found.—Yes, I recollect that, and when he made it at the board I felt confused, and I made an attempt to please Mr. Wilson by going to search for them, as he was so positive about them, and I did make a search and brought in every book that I thought would please him. Mr. Wilson said he did not wish to confuse, but I was not confused.

Dr. Nugent—You see the intervals here in 1859, of two or three months between the entries. What was the reason you did not make entries then? I was satisfied with the supplies, and because there is a difference between the old and new meat coming in; in point of fact, there was no occasion for my doing so.

Mr. Mahony—For September and October, 1859, there are no entries. What was the reason you did not make entries in these months? I had no occasion. How many days in the week is meat given? Four days, except on those which they call “oxhead days.” Is this meat of first rate quality?

Dr. Nugent—How could it be at $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. per lb.?

Mr. Kelly, (contractor)—Since last August had you any cause to complain of the provisions which I sent in?—On one occasion you sent in a bad oxhead.

Mr. Wilson—I will not put a question touching any matter which occurred between myself and Mr. Bodkin, as he may say one thing and I another; but I will ask you, Mr. Bodkin, were you present at a meeting of the board when I put a question to you and made a statement to the board. Do you recollect that a portion of that statement referred to a conversation between you and me?—Yes. I ask you now, on your solemn oath, after I made that statement as to what had occurred between you and me, did you not state that I made it accurately?—Is it as to the interlineation? No; but do you deny that you assented to what I stated?—I deny that I admitted there were entries in that book which do not now appear; but I admitted that there were interlineations which are there still. I did not go on the interlinations, because we do see they are there; but the point I want you to come to is this—I ask you on your solemn oath, whether I did not state on the 5th November that I called your attention to the entries complaining of the meat contractor subsequently to the 2d of July, and whether I did not state to you, in calling your attention to them, that it was very soon for these complaints to come in so early after the

enquiry ; and whether you did not, in the presence of the entire governors here, assent to the correctness of my statement ?—On my solemn oath, I never did. Recollect what you say ; Mr. Mahony was here, Mr. Maunsell was here, Mr. Hartigan was here, and they are now here, and I call on these gentlemen to correct you.

The Mayor—Mr. Bodkin has answered in the negative.

Mr. Wilson—I don't wish to do anything unfair or unkind ; but now, pray, pay particular attention to the question, for I am afraid you do not understand me ; and, therefore, I will put the question again to you ; and now throw the interlineations overboard. You heard me make a statement at the Board about the entries subsequent to the 2nd of July, and I told the Board that I pointed your attention to them, and said they were very soon after the enquiry ; and I now ask you, when I called on you to rebut or confirm my statement to the Board, did you not assent to its correctness ?—The entries that were in the book are there still.

Doctor Nugent—That is not the answer. Did you assent to the correctness of the observation made by Mr. Wilson on the 5th of November, with regard to the entries subsequent to the 2nd of July ?

Mr. Bodkin—I did not.

Mr. Maunsell—You admitted on that day that your orders were strict.

Mr. Mahony—I was here on the 5th of November, and I know something about this matter.

Mr. Wilson—Mr. Bodkin has made a statement on his oath, in presence of gentlemen who were here on the day to which I refer, and I call on you to examine Mr. Mahony and Mr. Maunsell.

The Mayor—Yes. Let the question be put to Mr. Mahony, on his oath.

Doctor Nugent—What is the question to be put to him ?

Mr. Wilson—At a meeting of the board held on the 5th of November, when I stated that I pointed his attention to entries subsequent to the 2nd of July—the interview with him being in August at the asylum—and remarked that these entries were too soon after the inquiry in July, whether he did not admit the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. Hartigan—I recollect the way it stood.

Dr. Nugent (to Mr. Bodkin)—Did you admit at the board on the 5th of November last the correctness of Mr. Wilson's statement ?—I did not acknowledge it ; and, possibly, could not acknowledge it ; and if I did, it would be untrue.

Dr. Nugent—That is your answer to the question which Mr. Wilson put, and you also answered that you possibly could not, and that it would be untrue if you did so ?—Yes.

William Hartigan, Esq., J.P., sworn and examined by Mr. Wilson—Did you hear me make a statement to this board on the 5th of November last, with regard to two entries in the provision report-book, complaining of the meat contractor, and that I had pointed Mr. Bodkin's attention to these entries, as recurring very soon after July, and did you not hear Mr. Bodkin reply that his orders were very strict ?

Mr. Hartigan—I recollect you making the statement as you now make it.

Mr. Wilson—And did Mr. Bodkin assent to it or dissent from it ?

Mr. Hartigan—He assented to it in general terms, and then wanted to

explain something or other about interlineations, but I rather think he was confused, and did not know what he was saying.

Mr. Bodkin—I liked to please Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Singleton—And to please Mr. Wilson, did you assent to what was not true?

Mr. Wilson (to Mr. Hartigan)—Did he assent to the correctness of my observations?

Mr. Hartigan—He gave a general answer. He did not dissent from the correctness of your statement.

Dr. Nugent—Did he dissent?

Mr. Hartigan—He did not dissent.

Mr. Bodkin (to Mr. Wilson)—I had a conversation with you in August, and it was a general one.

Dr. Nugent—I wish to ask Mr. Hartigan if it was your impression on and after the 5th of November that Mr. Bodkin acknowledged directly or indirectly that there was another book than this.

Mr. Hartigan—Oh, no; he was referring to this book.

Mr. Wilson—Bear this in mind; I am not referring to this book, but I am referring to the book in which I saw entries subsequent to July, and also that he assented to the correctness of my statement; that is what I am referring to.

John Watson Mahony, Esq., J.P. examined by Mr. Wilson—I ask you, Mr. Mahony, did you hear me make a clear and emphatic statement in regard to those entries subsequent to July, and did you not hear me state that those complaints were very soon after the inquiry was held, and that Mr. Bodkin gave me in reply that his orders were very strict; and now, Mr. Mahony, I ask you did you not hear me make that statement substantially, and did he or did he not corroborate it?

Mr. Mahony—I heard you make the statement, but I did not hear his answer to it. I asked him afterwards why he did not give that statement a flat contradiction, and he said that he had not had an opportunity for doing so; but I must say that the proceedings of that day were not carried on as they ought to be. I saw your statement afterwards in the papers, and I said it was a very serious charge to bring against an officer; and one of the directors said to me it was wrong to go again into it after an enquiry was had about it.

Dr. Nugent—Was this enquiry on oath?

Mr. Mahony—No; it was not.

Mr. Wilson—And are we to be told a statement made at the Board by an officer is to be scouted, or treated as nought.

Mr. Maunsell—No; but then it was not on oath? (gg)

Mr. Wilson (to Mr. Mahony)—Did you hear that statement which I made, and I ask you to give a direct answer to me, yes or no, Mr. Mahony?

Mr. Mahony—I am on my oath.

Mr. Wilson—I know you are, sir.

Mr. Mahony—I heard your statement, but I did not hear him assent to it.

Mr. Singleton—Did you hear him dissent from it?

Mayor—He did not hear him assent to it, and Mr. Mahony asked him afterwards why he did not dissent from it.

Wm. H. Maunsell, Esq., J.P., sworn and examined by Mr. Wilson.

I ask you, Mr. Maunsell, on your oath, did you hear me make the statement to the Board which you have heard me repeat here to-day, and did you hear Mr. Bodkin assent to or dissent from it?

Mr. Maunsell—I heard you make the statement, and he said that it was his duty to make those entries, and he alluded to interlineations, and he admitted the conversation, and said that his orders were strict.

Mr. Wilson—The conversation which I had with him was, that I stated there were complaints subsequent to the 2nd of July, and that they were very soon after the enquiry, and then he said that his orders were strict.

Mr. Maunsell—I did not hear him admit the fact, but he said that his orders were strict.

Mr. Singleton—Did he deny the subject of the conversation?

Mr. Maunsell—He did not.

Dr. Nugent (to Mr. Bodkin)—Did you deny that Mr. Wilson spoke to you on the subject?—I did not.

Mr. Wilson—As to how soon after the 2nd of July there should appear new charges against the contractor?—No sir. On your oath—when the conversation occurred between you and me, and when I said that you, Mr. Bodkin, at least had done your duty, what made you reply, “Yes, but I am placed in an awkward position”?

Doctor Nugent (before Mr. Bodkin replied, said)—I want to know from you if you had the books before you when Mr. Wilson said, How did it happen that after the 2nd of July the complaints against the contractor were so soon?—He never drew my attention to it.

The Mayor—You said that Mr. Wilson was there, and complimented you on doing your duty at all events, and then you said that you were placed in an awkward position: what did you mean by that?—This was as to things complained of up to that day.

Mr. Wilson—Mr. Bodkin brings to my mind a fact that I did not think of until now. I drew his attention to these entries after the 2nd of July, and he said that his orders were strict. I have now a perfect recollection of saying to him, “You, Mr. Bodkin, at all events appear to have been doing your duty, because you have made those entries after the 2nd of July.”

Dr. Nugent—It is quite clear that so far as this book is concerned, no question can arise on it, and because you can examine as to it every person here as to whether there is another book in the establishment or not. Mr. Bodkin has sworn already that there was no other, and that there is no other book, and he has sworn that he did not copy out another book into this book; but what I want to come to is, could there possibly be another book? And now do you, Mr. Bodkin, in this room and in the presence of God, swear that there has been no other, and that there is no other store-keepers’ book than this? Is that the fact?—That is the fact.

Mr. Wilson—Did you go out to look for another book when Mr. Monsell was here, and when I put the question to you?—Because you were so positive, I went out and brought in the books.

Mr. Monsell—He brought in every book.

—Fitzgerald, Esq., M.D., (resident physician to the asylum) examined by Dr. Nugent.

I am resident physician of this asylum for ten years, and during that time there has been no complaint of any kind against me.

Dr. Nugent—I want to examine you particularly about this book. You saw an entry written in that book by me. When did you examine it?—A month might elapse before I would see it, but there is no other book about the provisions but this one. Have you reason to suspect, or do you know there is another book in which the store-keeper's report is made?—Upon my solemn oath there is not another book but that. Did you see reports written in any other book but that?—I did not. Do you believe there is another book like that?—I believe there is not. On your oath has that book been tampered with, or have you spoken to Mr. Bodkin to influence him in any way about these provision reports?—I have not.

Mr. Singleton—Can you tell me is this the book in which the entries were originally made?—There is no other book.

Dr. Nugent—Did you ever see a slip of paper on which entries were made?—I have a slip of paper with one or two entries upon it, because I would not let them be put into this book pending this enquiry. Is there a book in which there might be a memorandum, and which Mr. Wilson might have seen?—No.

Mr. Wilson—Oh! doctor, don't take him out of it.

Dr. Fitzgerald—When this book was first produced, Mr. Wilson said, "That is not the book, it was a marble-covered one." (*hh*)

Dr. Nugent—Mr. Wilson has found fault with Dr. Fitzgerald for speaking to him in the market, and if you, Dr. Fitzgerald, said anything offensive to Mr. Wilson, as a gentleman and one of the governors of this institution—a gentleman actuated by the best motives, and doing the best he could for this institution—it is what you ought not to have done, and I am sure you regret it. (*ii*)

Dr. Fitzgerald—I did not attack Mr. Wilson either in the market or out of it; but Mr. Wilson was passing through the market, and then Mr. Kelly said, "Mr. Wilson, I beg your pardon, can I say a word to you?" and then the transaction occurred, but I did not speak loud, as Mr. Wilson said I did. (*jj*)

Mr. Wilson—Have you heard me read the list of entries in that book, or rather the extracts from it? and have you heard it stated by Mr. Hartigan that you said the complaints against the contractor were very light?—I did not say one word about their being quite light. Now, I ask you, after hearing all those reports about this meat, do you believe that the complaints were of a light nature?—I do; I think they were light, and the reason why I gave that answer to Mr. Hartigan was, that Mr. Kelly was a satisfactory contractor, inasmuch as he sent up meat for that which was not approved of, and on the whole I stated that he was a satisfactory contractor. I said that then on my word, and I say it on my oath now, and I am not ashamed of its going into the public papers. With respect to ox-heads, I believe that Mr. Monsell said it was impossible to get them, and when Mr. Kelly could not get them he always sent up meat.

Mr. Singleton—Are you in the habit of seeing those reports?—I have not seen any of those for a considerable time.

The Mayor—I wish to ask Dr. Fitzgerald is it the store-keeper's duty to inspect the provisions coming into the house? Yes, it is his duty to see that they are of the proper quantity and quality.

Mr. Wilson—There is an order of the Board of 23rd May, 1859, coun-

tersigned by the Inspector, that the clerk and store-keeper should thenceforward note daily the quality of the meat, milk, and bread supplied to the institution, and when of bad quality, better is to be purchased in the market, and the difference in price to be charged against the contractor in the next monthly disbursement; and then follows a request to the resident physician that he will note daily the quality of the meat, milk, bread, &c. supplied to the institution, and those orders have not been complied with.

Dr. Nugent—I can understand that silence gives consent; when there are no entries, it must be taken that there are no complaints; and so far as that goes, I would not find fault. The only fault that I find is when the meat is inferior and returned, and then an explanatory entry is made, explaining that good meat was sent to replace that which was returned; this I think to be a very inconvenient mode, but the institution does not suffer much by it. (kk)

The Mayor—The practice adopted in the city jail is to make a note daily whether the provisions be good or bad, and that is the more regular way, instead of drawing inferences from the silence of the report-book; and therefore the order entered here would be better complied with.

Mr. Maunsell—The two chaplains at the county jail report upon the quality of the milk, but no further.

Mr. Laurence Kelly (the contractor) sworn and examined by Dr. Nugent—I have been contractor to the institution for the last eight years. With regard to the charges as to the quality of the meat he supplied, in every case in which it was returned, I gave other meat to far greater value in exchange. With regard to his deficiency in the supply of ox-heads, he stated that he supplied as many of them as were procurable in Limerick. He had always honestly and conscientiously fulfilled his contract; and any contractor, with the best possible intentions, might be deficient for a time. He had repeatedly meat returned, which he found to be of as good quality as any he had sold. He had been called on before on similar charges to the present; but instead of being allowed to die out when over, they were revived on every possible occasion; and he asserted some of the charges were most frivolous ones. Last April he was called forward, and Mr. Wilson then, if he did not dissent from the justice of the charges, did not assent to them.

Mr. Wilson—Not only that, but I said you were badly treated, if you did not get notice of the charges made against you.

Mr. Kelly—From that moment to the present there is no complaint of any description against me. I am held as a defaulter, and my character aspersed; and is that the way to treat a contractor who has been giving his property this season at a sacrifice of from 60 to 80 per cent. Some meat has been returned to me which two or three county governors, on examining it, pronounced to be of excellent quality. He called on the press to take down his observations.

Mr. Boyse—I saw it, and it could not be better meat, and two country gentlemen who were here on the day pronounced it good meat.

Dr. Nugent—It is only fair to Mr. Kelly that the fact should be known that these two or three gentlemen unanimously pronounced meat which was objected to here, to be of very good quality.

Mr. Kelly—I wish again to repeat that until last April I never heard

before of these complaints having been made. I have held contracts representing at least half a million of money, and never had so much trouble with them all put together. When I heard these reports read by Mr. Wilson in April last, I was quite surprised that such charges should have been made against me, for if there was ground for any substantial charge, the proper time to call my attention to it was at the time of the occurrence.

Dr. Nugent said that Mr. Wilson having cognizance of these complaints had no alternative, as a governor of that institution, but to call for the enquiry. The whole question now was whether Mr. Kelly or Mr. Bodkin was the most correct judge of meat.

The Mayor—Mr. Kelly has said that he was charged here and put on his trial; but there is no charge against him here to-day. The enquiry here to-day is about a book which is said to have been mutilated. If there was a charge against Mr. Kelly, he would be permitted to exculpate himself; but there is no charge, as I have said, against him. (ll) The charge here is, that certain entries were made in a certain book belonging to this institution, and that when the governor went to examine the book which contained those entries, and which he alleges he had previously seen, and to which he called the clerk's attention, he could not find them. And now, having all the evidence that can be had on this subject, I think some conclusion ought to be come to on the question.

Mr. Mahony—Before you conclude, I must observe that there ought to be some authority constituted to judge of the meat, for at present it is left to be judged of by the caprice or ignorance of one person. We have evidence before us to-day, that the meat which was declared to be bad, and rejected, was pronounced to be good by persons who were competent to judge. (mm)

Mr. Wilson—I was going to wind up the proceedings by reading a paper which I had drawn up, but as I see that the board is somewhat impatient at the length to which the proceedings have extended, I will merely read the concluding passage, to show what my opinion of the clerk was:—"Much as I feel I have to complain of the clerk in the course which he has at present thought proper to adopt, yet he appears to me, by his entries in his books up to a certain date, to have been the only person, whether of Governors, Inspector, or Manager, who was invariably, fearlessly, and impartially doing his duty towards the unfortunate inmates."

Dr. Nugent—I think that a most insulting remark.

Mr. Wilson—But it is, nevertheless, true. I have stated that the reports were tampered with, and I have sworn that I believe they were tampered with, and I now withdraw.

Mr. Wilson here left the board room, though pressed to remain, especially by the Mayor, to whose conduct as Chairman Mr. Wilson bore testimony, and thanked him for his courtesy towards himself.

After some debating, carried on in a very desultory fashion, as to the form and wording of the resolution, the following resolution, drawn up by Dr. Nugent, and read by that learned gentleman, was proposed by Mr. Singleton, seconded by Dr. Gibson, put from the chair, and passed unanimously:—

"Resolved—That after a lengthened examination on oath, the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum are satisfied that no tampering with the report book, or of any reports with reference to contracts could have taken place; and that the charges made are not borne out by the evidence. At the same time, the Governors believe that Mr. Wilson felt he was justified in the course he thought proper to adopt." (nn)

Mr. Boyce then proposed and Mr. Hartigan seconded the following resolution, which was also carried unanimously :—

"The Board, in consequence of Mr. Wilson's observations, that the Government officer did all he could to defeat enquiry, deem it due to Dr. Nugent (if Mr. Wilson's observations refer to him) to express their dissent therefrom, and to state that Dr. Nugent, in his official capacity, has invariably supported the interests of the institution, by his advice and frequent attendance at its meetings."

The enquiry then terminated, and nearly all the directors of which it was constituted took their departure.

LIMERICK DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LIMERICK CHRONICLE.

SIR—The enquiry as to matters arising out of the meat contract is over. Though various suggestions arise as to the mode in which it was conducted—of how it should have been conducted—(of which the Mayor appears to have thrown out a hint)—as to who should not have been the person to conduct it—and to the omission of any allusion to many facts which appeared to have called for special notice—I shall confine my few observations, to the two resolutions, by which the enquiry was concluded.

The 1st resolution states "That no tampering with the report-book, or with any reports with reference to contracts, could have taken place as represented, and that the charges made, are not borne out by the evidence, but that at the same time, the Governors believe Mr. Wilson was justified in the course he thought proper to adopt."

I must confess that I find it difficult to comprehend how any person could be deemed justified in—deliberately—positively—and without a loophole for equivocation—swearing to a fact as having occurred—which the resolution distinctly states could not have taken place as represented.

Whether this is the resolution—or a part of it—which it is said Dr. Nugent had drawn up, and which was anxiously searched for as I was leaving the room, I know not—but the moment I obtained an authentic copy of it at the Asylum, I lost no time in completing my deposition before the Mayor, in order to remove any difficulty that might be supposed to exist—in the way of making me amenable.

With regard to the 2nd resolution—amounting to a vote of confidence in Dr. Nugent—I have to say, that the gentleman reported to have proposed

it, is one of those alluded to in my note to the notice of the 22nd of August, who, uncalled for, stated—they would have attended the enquiry held by Dr. Nugent on the 2nd of July, had they had any notice of its being to be held—and that he thought Dr. Nugent very much to blame in not having given notice of it !

Of the gentleman who seconded the resolution, I have to say, being, as he was—the person who originally directed my attention to the entries—who subsequently repeated to me his conversation with Dr. Fitzgerald (and which led to the re-opening of the affair)—and who had been present at all the meetings when the matter was under discussion—that I called on him and read over the entire of my statement with which he was at all mixed up—and that he bore testimony in strong terms to its accuracy.

And I have also to state—that he was present at the meeting of the 5th of November, and that, when about to part—he declared he could not at all see how the clerk's admission as to my having pointed out to him the entries after the 2nd of July, could be got over.

I remain, &c.

D. J. WILSON.

Belvoir, Dec. 21st, 1860.

P.S.—The proceedings would appear to present some extraordinary features at every stage,—for, since the above was written, the Governor who is reported to have proposed the second resolution came up to me, and, in the presence of several persons, positively asserted that he had not done so !

And, having heard (from what I considered good authority) that the resolutions were interlined, after the Mayor, as chairman, had signed them and left the room, I proceeded to the Asylum to examine them. When the interlinings and scorings out took place, I am not, from my own knowledge (having previously absented myself), in a position to say ; but I do say that the first resolution as I saw it on Saturday, the 22nd instant, at 11 o'clock, a.m., in its clonglomerate state, unmistakeably bore out the adage as to "too many cooks ;" and there was such an extraordinary delay in producing the second (though when it did appear evidently coming from a master pen) that I deemed it prudent, bearing antecedents in mind, to give a written notice as to their safe preservation.

APPENDIX.

NOTES.



(A) The *some* document I requested to be sent to me was a *correct* copy of a letter I had addressed to the Secretary of the Inspectors, on the 9th of November—an *incorrect* copy which had been sent to me, totally altering its meaning—I required it in the event of my being able to attend the next meeting—I did not say I *would* attend the next meeting—because I was not certain I *could* do so.

(B) This does not always follow—as see notice page 13.

(C) I have no doubt Dr. Nugent made this statement to the Board, but Dr. Nugent has not told us *why* he so much regretted Mr. Wilson's absence.

(D) What were those specific allegations that the Board did not see any occasion to enquire into—and that appeared in the books of Dublin Castle—and that Dr. Nugent did not think proper to name? My only allegations were contained in my letter of June 8th, 1860, and appear at page 9.

(E) The Inspector says “he did not go out of his way to compliment any party.” Notwithstanding, his confidently taking credit to himself for the fair—honest—and frank manner, in which he conducted an enquiry—without notice—behind the back of the person who had applied for it.

(F) “Not a *syllable* in the letter that was not correct and true.” Rare!!!

(G) The governors did *not* abdicate their functions—they enquired into and pronounced upon the affair of the meat, and contractor, and the Resident Physician getting his meat at contract price.

(H) *How* came he to know this, and when. It was either *before* or *after* he came to Limerick? I give the Inspector his choice—which?

(I) The matter which led to Mr Wilson's letter applying for enquiry had not occurred at the time of the “former meeting,” for as repeatedly stated it was out of the proceedings of—and occurred immediately *after* that former meeting.

(J) See extracts from Report Book even as it now stands at pages 22, 23, 24. A statement appeared in one of the papers that the complaints were but *three or four in eight years*.

(K) I received two copies of the Report from the Under Secretary. The word “originally” did not appear in that first sent to me. Whether the *significant addendum* was made in the Secretary's or Inspector's office I know *not*—but *I do know* that the governors expressed themselves in much stronger terms of disapproval at the matters which met the light the third time, when compelled to bring the subject before them in self defence, than they did on either of the two previous occasions.

(L) What were the charges—If not specified in writing—how came the Inspector to know what was to be enquired into in the absence of the person who applied for the enquiry—and who had written *vaguely*.

(M) This “absent man” in *Ireland*—is sadly—sorely—unfairly dealt with, and has much to complain of, because the “absent man” in *England*—(and whose absence was so *very much regretted*) presumed, on his return to Ireland to complain through the public press, of the mock enquiry which had been held in his absence—and the more than mock report, by which it was followed.

(N) For the proof of the carrying out of Dr. Nugent's “*professions*”—I refer to Dr. Nugent's opening speech, and subsequent questions—and observations. And to Dr. Nugent's selected proof of “my unbecoming conduct” (*viz.*, my letter of the 8th of June, 1860), I refer for my triumphant acquittal.

(O) And yet it never made an appearance for more than three months after—and not then, until extorted by my letter of the 15th of March.

(P) When and for how long was the Resident Physician absent? The entries, even as I have extracted them—extend over a period of near a year and a half.

(Q) Dr. Nugent states the governors felt I had previously adopted a “proper course.”

Now I am yet to learn if "that course" brought upon me the offensive conduct of the Resident Physician and contractor in the meat market—that I was acting in a manner "unbecoming any man," in writing this letter.

(R) This refers to the flat contradiction which took place between Mr. Hartigan, and the Resident Physician.

(S) This did not reach me till the 24th.

(T) See note K.

(U) On the 2nd January, 1860, the Resident Physician made a similar statement to me, as a reason for no meeting being held on that day.

(V) The Resident Physician at one of the meetings of the Board, said he would explain why my notice of the 22nd August was not inserted in my summons for September. He did not do so.

(W) This alludes to the entries of complaints that I saw the last week in August—especially to those after the 2nd of July in the entry which was interlined—and their numbers, as compared with the word *rare*.

(X) What zeal is evinced in this instance—and how laudable as compared with the *no notice* to the Governors—and the *no enquiry* for data, to guide Inspectors for the investigation in July.

(Z) Already disposed of.

(AA) The contract for 1860 was for "round half quarters and cross-cuts of the best beef with joints of mutton as required of the best quality—and ox-heads—for twelve months, at 3½d.—and ox-heads at 12d. With a power to the resident physician, if the articles were "not of good quality, to go into the market to purchase." Was that done? and how often? Let the reader compare the entries with the terms of the contract, and if the former be correct—pronounce.

The resident physician, at page 34, says the contractor "was a satisfactory contractor inasmuch as he sent meat in place of that which was not approved of." If that was the case, how does he account for there being, in the many instances of complaint, so few noted where meat in accordance with the contract was substituted—or if duly substituted, whenever there was cause to complain—how does he account for the many times the patients are represented, as being short of their allowance—soup, meat, &c. &c.

(BB) I make no charge for any breach of contract—I have no knowledge of it—I deal with the entries—they may be true, they may be false.—Is it true—or is it false—that not a single ox-head was supplied to the inmates on the 24th December, 1859. Is it true or is it false that Mr. Kelly—who stated "he sent in all the ox-heads that could be had for love or money"—had no beasts slaughtered for himself at Christmas-time, 1859.

(CC) "Gratuitous information"—what other information did he expect from me—I did not require to be compelled to give my evidence—I did require my deposition should be taken, and am glad I did so.

(DD) This is disposed of in a note to my last letter to his Excellency.

(EE) This is not the case, as see entry 29th August, 1859—January 31st, 1860—but by the Inspector's minute, May 23rd, 1859, the *quality* was to be *daily* noted.

(FF) Let us suppose the leaves with the entries for July and ~~suggest~~, which I saw in the latter end of August, were with June, all taken out—how easy—how *necessary* was it—to make some entry on the next page, to those that had been extracted. But whether the entries for June which now appear were made in June—or subsequent to the latter end of August, when I viewed the book—what, I ask, has become of the entries for July, August, and September, 1860? One would naturally suppose, that immediately after the enquiry of the 2nd of July, there would have been a more strict adherence to the order of the Inspector of the 23rd of May, 1859, as to the making daily entries. It was my seeing the entries which appeared after the 2nd of July, that caused me to say to the clerk, "you at least appear to be doing your duty."

(GG) It is difficult to deal with Mr. Mahony's answer to my question—and Dr. Nugent's, and Mr. Maunsel's observation, as to what took place on the 5th of November "not being on oath," I look on as rather strange. Was it intended to throw a doubt over, or weaken the effects of any statements, made on any occasions, that were not made on oath? If so—what becomes of the formal enquiry of the 2nd of July—which was "not on oath." Mr. Mahony says "the proceedings of the 5th November were not carried on as they ought to be"—but he does not state in what respect—and I heard nobody else say they were irregular—I did not hear one word of contradiction—or the chairman call any Governor to order—not only was there no contradiction—but Mr. Mahony himself swore—he did not hear even a dissent from the clerk (before the Board) to the statement I had made. Mr. Mahony does say "he

"asked the clerk why he did not give my statement a flat contradiction—and the clerk said "he had not an opportunity to do so"—Now after I made my statement—it caused the room to be cleared, for ten or fifteen minutes—of the two physicians, the clerk, and myself. On our return the subject was renewed—and that the Board sat till a late hour on that day, I have reason to particularly recollect, from a conversation I had with one of the Governors with whom I walked into town. It is to be regretted that neither the clerk nor Mr. Mahony called the attention of the Board to the "flat contradiction" that could be given to my statement—either on the 5th of November or the 5th of December—(when on both occasions the matter to which it referred was before the Board)—rather than reserve themselves till the 17th of December.

I made my statement—if the Board was under the impression that its correctness had not been admitted and that the clerk was evading—is it likely he would not have been called on for an admission, or disclaimer, either by me or by the Board?

(HH) I said the book then produced was not the book in which I saw the entries, or if the book,—not in the same state, as when I saw it in August. That the book in which I then saw the entries, was a *thin unbound* book, and as I believed with a marble cover—and such is still my BELIEF as to the cover—such my *positive* assertion—and *unalterable* conviction as to the book itself—*thin and unbound*.

(II) "Actuated by the best motives," &c. &c. &c.!!! Disposed of in my second letter to his Excellency.

(JJ) "And then the transaction occurred"—The "attack" is denied—the "loud tone" is denied—but the *transaction* is admitted. What "transaction" I would ask? Was it the transaction which was the cause of my applying for enquiry? The transaction where an officer of a public institution followed one of its Governors through the public shambles, putting a question to a contractor, tending to falsify a statement of the Governor, at a meeting of its Board, a few minutes before. The "transaction" which led to the enquiry of the 2nd of July—when all allusion to the "transaction" was omitted if not by "particular desire"—by "good arrangement." If it be said the Inspector was in ignorance of the "data" he was to go on, at the enquiry of the 2nd of July—why not then apply for "data"—as he did for the enquiry about to be held on the 17th of December? For had the Inspector so applied—he would "not have been denied," for he had not up to that time entitled himself to a refusal.

(KK) If Dr. Nugent "understands that silence gives consent"—then am I,—relying on the sworn testimony of Mr. Hartigan—Mr. Mahony—and Mr. Maunsel that the clerk *did not dissent from my statement* on the 5th November—entitled to claim credit for the clerk's *assent* to that statement. Dr. Nugent says he has no fault to find with entries not being made when there is no cause of complaint—if so, where was the necessity for his order of the 25th May, 1859, for a *daily* entry.

(LL) Quite true I (as I said before) knew not whether the contractor had been fulfilling his contract or not—I dealt with the entries in the complaint book as pointed out to me in the first instance—and in the second instance dealt with them to test the truthfulness of Dr. Nugent's term "*rare*."

(MM) What pity Mr. Mahony who has been so constant an attendant at the Asylum, and known the clerk so long, did not make this discovery some twelve months ago, ere he pointed my attention to entries not now to be found. See month of March, 1860. What a deal of trouble and annoyance I should have been saved—what a pity he was not then aware of the incompetency of the clerk, to judge of the fulfilment of the meat contract—even though we may assume, he had the assistance of the resident physician, as far as regarded the *quality*—inasmuch as Dr. Nugent reported, "that the resident physician and the patients were supplied from the same animals—for the most part."

But though Mr. Mahony may now denounce the clerk as incompetent to judge of the *quality* of the meat—he perhaps may admit him as competent to distinguish—a neck of beef, from a round, or a cross-cut, from a shank—or if incompetent to pronounce, on these knotty points—he may be admitted as competent to form a correct opinion—between the substances meat—and bone. See entries at pages 22–23.

Mr. Mahony says meat rejected was pronounced by competent persons to be good. Mr. Boyce and the contractor also say it was good—granted—and yet it may not have been in accordance with the contract.—It may have occurred on one of those days that the meat was returned in consequence of there being too great a proportion of bone—but if such prime meat was returned unjustly, why was not the matter brought before the Board at the time?—I never heard that it was.

(NN) Disposed of in my letters to his Excellency.

Dr. Nugent says he put the resolution in form precisely as it is given. As it stood when I saw it, the first paragraph was in the handwriting of the clerk, who said he had copied it. The second appeared to be in that of Mr. Singleton—the interlineations by—God knows who.

First Resolution as it appeared on the 22nd December.

Resolved, that after a lengthened examination on oath, the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum are ^{fully} satisfied that no tampering of the report-book, or of any reports with reference to con-
^{that Institution} tracts for ~~add~~ ^{as represented,} could have taken place, ^{in this respect} and that the charges made ~~against the officers~~ are not borne out by evidence.

At the same time the governors believe that Mr. Wilson felt he was justified in the course he thought proper to adopt.

I. M.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, February 7th, 1861.

MY LORD,

On the 17th of last December an enquiry was held at the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum by Dr. Nugent, arising out of a statement which had been made by me at the monthly meeting of the Board in November.

The Inspector having, in his opening speech, arraigned me in no measured terms, and having declared "he would examine witnesses on oath, and that there would be no humbug or delay, and, as far as he could, would endeavour to elicit the whole truth, and make his report on it within forty-eight hours," I naturally felt anxious to see the report, and made frequent enquiries on the subject.

The resident physician, however, at the meeting of the Board on Monday last, having stated he thought I laboured under a mistake as to Dr. Nugent's intentions, I now, as the person most deeply interested in the matter, respectfully request to be informed whether the Inspector has made his report, and if it be not your Excellency's intention to make a communication to the Board of Governors upon the subject, whether there is any objection to my being favoured with a copy of it.

I have the honour to be, &c., &c.,

D. J. WILSON.

To the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle,
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Dublin Castle, 11th February, 1861.

SIR,

With reference to your letter of the 7th instant, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit to you the enclosed copy of "Minutes of Proceeding of the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum at a Special Meeting, held on the 17th of December last," being the only report received by government of the enquiry adverted to in your communication.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS W. LARCOM.

D. J. Wilson, Esq.,
Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge.

Minutes of Proceedings of the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, at a Special Meeting, held the 17th day of December, 1860, pursuant to a Resolution of the Board of 5th November last.

Present:—Rt. Worshipful John F. McSheehy, Mayor, Chairman; William Howley, D.L.; Henry Maunsel, Esq.; David J. Wilson, Esq.; John W. Mahony, Esq.; Thomas Boyse, Esq.; John Singleton, Esq.;

William Hartigan, Esq.; William Gibson, Esq.; Doctor Nugent, Inspector of Lunatic Asylums; and Doctor Gelston, Visiting Physician, also attended; reporters from the press also present.

Doctor Nugent having stated the object for which this meeting was called, read the resolution of the Board of 5th November as follows:—“That Mr. Wilson having made a statement which involves a charge against some person in the establishment having tampered with the Provisions and Report-book, and abstracted a certain number of reports,—resolved, that the Inspector be requested to appoint an early day to investigate this report on oath.”

The following persons having been severally sworn and examined upon oath; viz., the stationer from whom the book in question was purchased, Mr. David J. Wilson, who alleges that certain entries of his complaints against a contractor have been abstracted from the provision and report-book; the clerk and storekeeper, who enters and signs complaints in that book; and the manager, who countersigns them; also three of the directors. The evidence having been fully gone into and brought to a after a considerable lapse of time, it was

Proposed by John Singleton, Esq., seconded by William Gibson, Esq., and—“Resolved unanimously, That, after a lengthened examination on oath, the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum are fully satisfied that no tampering of the report-book, or of any reports with reference to contracts for that institution, could have taken place as represented; and that the charges made are not borne out by evidence. At the same time the guardians believe that Mr. Wilson felt he was justified in the course he thought it proper to adopt.

Proposed by Thomas Boyse, Esq., and seconded by William Hartigan, Esq., and—Resolved, That the Board, in consequence of Mr. Wilson's observations, that “the government officer did all he could to defeat enquiry,” deem it due to Doctor Nugent (if Mr. Wilson's observations refer to him) to express their dissent therefrom, and to state that Doctor Nugent, in his official capacity, has invariably supported the interests of the institution by his advice and frequent attendance at its meetings.

(Signed),

JOHN F. MCSHEEHY,
Mayor and Chairman.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, March 15th, 1861.

MY LORD,

Feeling that I have just cause to complain of the course pursued towards me by the Under Secretary and Inspector of Lunatic Asylums (Dr. Nugent), as originating the necessity of the accompanying report and letter, and consequently entailing on me no small amount of trouble, anxiety, and cost, I deem myself justified in earnestly but respectfully requesting your Excellency's particular attention to the facts which they disclose.

Evenhanded justice is all that I ask for; to that I feel I am entitled. Awaiting your Excellency's pleasure,

I have the honour to be

Your Excellency's obedient servant,

D. J. WILSON.

Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle, &c., &c.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, March 15th, 1861.

*To the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle, &c. &c.,
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, &c., &c.*

MY LORD,

The Under Secretary has, by direction of your Excellency, in reply to my letter of the 7th of February, favoured me with a copy of a minute of the proceedings of the Board of Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, at a special meeting held on the 17th of December last, and states it is the only report received by government of the enquiry adverted to in my communication to your Excellency.

The intimation of the Inspector that he was sent down by your Excellency and Mr. Cardwell "to conduct the enquiry," and his declaration, "that there should be no humbug, and that he would examine upon oath, elicit the whole truth, and report within forty-eight hours," appears to form a strange contrast to the communication of the Under Secretary, announcing that the minute had been the only report received, up to the 11th of February. I put the government in possession (through documents) of facts which were very generally supposed, as showing sufficient grounds to disqualify the individual for the task; and more than sufficient grounds for him to plead exemption, had he thought proper to do so—whether he did seek to be excused—or volunteered—or whether government insisted on his undertaking the task,—I am left to conjecture.

I have now (as it appears your Excellency has been left in ignorance of the evidence that led to the resolutions by which the proceedings of the 17th of December were terminated) to request your Excellency's attention to the accompanying Report of them by a person recommended to me as in every way competent to the task. My instructions to him were, to be careful not to omit a scintilla of the evidence that might appear to bear against me.

I know not what your Excellency's opinion will be, but I think I am quite safe in saying that the general feeling, after a perusal of the report, and even without witnessing the demeanour of the Inspector, at the enquiry, was that he *should not have been the person appointed to conduct it.*

I place the report before your Excellency in its simple form, and without those notes or comments for which it is arranged, and which I feel it calls for; and shall now merely take leave to call attention—to the line of proceeding adopted by the Inspector—and the resolutions arising out of the enquiry—against both of which I enter my most earnest, and unqualified protest.

Against the 1st resolution—because its first part virtually (though not in words) goes to charge me *with having fabricated a statement as to a fact, which it states could not have occurred*—which I had put forward at a meeting of the Board, and to the truth of which I *solemnly, and deliberately swore*, at another meeting of the Board.

Against the second part of the 1st resolution, because it states "the governors believe Mr. Wilson felt he was justified in the course he thought proper to adopt,"—that course being (if the first part of the resolution were true) that he had fabricated—propagated—and ultimately *solemnly and deliberately sworn* to what he *must have known* to be false,—

for, if in accordance with the first part of the resolution, it *could not have occurred*.

Against the first part of the resolution, because it states—that the governors are unanimously of opinion that *could* not have occurred, which *might* have occurred—viz., the “tampering with reports,” not the abstraction of leaves from the *present* report-book, inasmuch as I swore (see page 27) “my impression is, nothing was taken out of the book, as it now stands”

Against the second part of the 1st resolution, as expressing a belief I felt I was justified in violating a law, both human and divine, by the bearing of false witness—my swearing having been direct and positive—and without the slightest qualification—I repudiate this unworthy attempt at extenuation, in the terms it deserves.

Against the first part of the 1st resolution, because it states (as it now stands) that the governors are *fully satisfied* in the conclusion they come to—whereas it is thought by many, that there existed ample grounds for *considerable doubt*; and, I believe, by not a few, that there were ample grounds for *no doubt*, the other way.

Against the entire of the resolution, because I consider it at variance with itself, with fact, and with common sense.

Against the entire of the resolution, because I have good reason to believe it was tampered with (in order to render it more pointed) after it had been signed by the Mayor, and after all the governors but one (who have all denied any participation in the act) had departed from the Board-room. From the one who remained, and the Inspector—I have received no disclaimer.

I protest against the 2nd resolution, inasmuch as I feel that the facts disclosed at the late enquiry, go to prove, that the Inspector (the person alluded to) did most effectually defeat enquiry, by his course of proceeding on the 2nd of July.

1st.—In not giving, or causing to be given, in the usual summons, notice to the governors that he purposed holding the enquiry—two of them having assured me they would have attended had they known it was to have been held,—Mr. Spring Rice being one of them, as see his letter.—page 26.

2nd.—Because there could have been no more effectual mode of defeating enquiry, than by proceeding with an investigation in the absence of the person most competent to give testimony—viz., the person who had applied for it.

3rd.—Because it is questionable whether the plea assigned for not postponing it—viz., the “imputations resting on the characters of two of the officers of the establishment in the books at Dublin Castle,” or the plea assigned for the holding it, without notice to me—viz., “my name appearing as the seconder of a resolution which was to have been proposed,” was the most flimsy or untenable.

Inasmuch as the Inspector, notwithstanding his great anxiety to dispose of “imputations hanging over *two* of the officers in the books at Dublin Castle,” never once deemed it necessary to make the slightest allusion in his report to one of those officers; and inasmuch as it is contrary to common sense, or usage in any court or institution, to suppose that, because a man was expected to be present to support a measure which

did not come off, he should, as a matter of course, have been present, and prepared to go into another case of a totally different nature, of which he had got no notice, although applying for it.—page 9, July 2nd.

I protest against the concluding part of the 2nd resolution, which states “that Dr. Nugent, in his official capacity, has *invariably* supported the interests of the institution by his advice and frequent attendance at its meetings.” I refer to the report of the proceedings of the late enquiry, now before your Excellency, in support of this protest.

At page 30, Mr. Mahony asks the clerk, “Is the meat of first rate quality,” and the Inspector *answers for the clerk*, “How could it be at 2½d. per lb.”

Now the Inspector, when he gave this palliatory reply (instead of allowing the clerk to answer for himself), either knew the terms of the contract, or he did not. If he did not know them, he should not have given this reply; and if he did know them, he most certainly should not have volunteered the reply, inasmuch as the contract price was 3¼d. per lb.—not 2½d.; but whether 2½d., 3¼d., or 10¼d., it mattered not; the terms of the contract were for “*round half quarters and cross-cuts of the BEST beef, with joints of mutton, as required, of the best quality.*” Did the entries state the patients were served in accordance with these terms? did the Inspector, when he answered for the clerk, know that they ought to have been so served?

Having been ordered by your Excellency to enquire into matters arising out of the meat contract, one would suppose he ought to have made himself master of the terms of the contract. Did he do so, and with the nature of the entries in the report-book, ere he reported?

Again we find, on referring to the report-book, even as it at present stands, that from the 4th of July to the 29th of August, inclusive, a period of *seven* weeks, there were entries of *fifteen* complaints against contractors—*six* meat, *three* milk, and *six* bread; from the 12th of November to the 27th of December, inclusive, a period of *six* weeks, *thirteen* complaints—one chandler, *one* clothier, *two* bread, *two* milk, and *seven* meat; while for the interval between these two periods, viz., the 29th of August and the 12th of November, being a period of *eleven* weeks, there *does not appear* (as the book now stands) a *single entry* of any description, whether with regard to *milk, meat, bread, or any other* contract whatsoever.

The Inspector felt it necessary to allude to this *extraordinary blank* at the enquiry of the 17th of December, 1860, and he asked the clerk, “What was the reason you did not make entries then?” answer—“I was satisfied with the supplies, and because there was a difference between the *old* and *new* meat coming in—in point of fact, there was no occasion for my doing so.” And the Inspector was, it appears, quite as satisfied with this answer as a reason for his order of the 23rd of May, 1859, directing that the *quality* of the provisions should be *daily noted*, not being carried out during a period of *eleven consecutive weeks*, as the clerk was satisfied with the *quality* of all the meat supplies during that time; and the same satisfaction, we are to assume, extended to the difference between *old* and *new* wheat, *old* and *newly-calved* cows, *old* and *new* clothing, *old* and *new* tallow, and we are also to suppose the *new* cattle coming to market in *September* and *October*, and up to the 12th of *November*, 1860, were com-

posed of ox-heads, cross-cuts, round half quarters, and were without necks, shanks, or coarse pieces.

In point of fact, it would appear from the course of the examination, we are expected to believe—that all the contractors to the institution, whether *intuitively* or by *combination*—suddenly ceased to give any cause to complain of the several articles they were bound to furnish—continued to do so for *eleven consecutive weeks*—and then they as *intuitively* relapsed into their former habits—and there are *thirteen* complaints within *six* weeks!

And I further protest against the 2nd resolution, because the governor, who was reported as having proposed the 2nd resolution, and which passed *unanimously*, not only disclaimed in presence of several persons his ever having proposed it, but subsequently declared, under his hand, he was not present at the passing of the 1st resolution (see his letter of the 9th of February).

Because *four* of the *eight* governors, who are represented in the minute forwarded to your Excellency by Dr. Nugent as *unanimously* passing this resolution, laudatory of Dr. Nugent, who they say “invariably supported the interests of the institution,” were also present at the *meeting* of the 2nd of *July*.

And because they did, at the *meeting* of the Board in *November*, at which they were also present (when applied to on the subject by me), distinctly *dissent* from the *statement made by Dr. Nugent* in the report which he forwarded to your Excellency of the enquiry of the 2nd of *July*, so far as it referred to the *most material* point in the report; viz., the *entries* regarding the *non-fulfilment* of the *meat* contract, and which stated the complaints to be VERY RARE.

In the *Maryborough* case (if I am correctly informed) the Inspector who conducted the enquiry had a reporter to take down the evidence. At the enquiry at *Limerick*, notwithstanding the observation from the Mayor that “he did not see how a report could be drawn up in a satisfactory mode, unless the evidence was taken down,” the evidence was not taken down by any accredited person, or any deposition made, except by myself.

In the *Maryborough* case, it would appear from Mr. Cardwell's letter, 4th December, 1860, that a *report was made* to your Excellency.

In the *Limerick* case, from General Larcom's letter, it would appear *no report was made* to your Excellency, and that a mere *minute* of the proceedings, and the *resolutions* passed, were all that was furnished.

In the *Maryborough* case, your Excellency had an *opportunity* of judging whether the report accorded with the evidence.

In the *Limerick* case, it would appear, your Excellency had *neither report or evidence* to refer to, to enable your Excellency to judge of the sufficiency of the grounds upon, or the circumstances under which, the resolutions were passed.

As the Inspector did not, in accordance with his pledge, make his report, I now take leave to place before your Excellency the one I have already alluded to, as it appeared in the *Limerick Chronicle*—should it be questioned on any of the points I have referred to, I will also furnish copies of the proceedings, as they appeared in the *two other Limerick papers*.

Your Excellency directed the Inspector to institute enquiry into matters connected with the meat contract at the *Limerick asylum*, in *July* last. Did

he take the proper, *the usual steps*, preparatory to an enquiry, to *secure the presence of all those who are supposed to attend on such occasions*?

Again I ask, did the Inspector (as I conceive was his duty) refer to the several documents and records in the institution connected with the matter he had been ordered to enquire into, on the 2nd of July, ere he made his report?

He either did or he did not—in either case what is his position, who, in his opening address at the *late* enquiry, so lauds his mode of conducting the *former* enquiry, and *the report* by which it was followed.

What I ask is his position as regards your Excellency—who, I assume, expected from him a *fair, impartial, and truthful* report—if *he had not inspected and examined the records he 'adverted to as connected with the matter on which he undertook to report.*

What again I ask is his position *if he did inspect* those records and the *entries*, as they appear in the report which I forwarded to your Excellency, and *which entries*, notwithstanding the charge of the resident physician against me, Dr. Nugent has admitted to *have been truly copied.*

Were those entries *truthfully* reported on by the Inspector? If they were, why did the *governors present* on the *2nd of July* and the *5th of November* dissent from *his statement* with regard to them.

Again I ask what is the Inspector's position when we come to calmly and dispassionately compare the entries with the report, as it affects the unfortunate inmates, incapable of complaint, and often (if the entries be true) short of the allowance prescribed for them. Does the report of the *Inspector*, I would respectfully ask your Excellency, bespeak the *protector* of the unfortunate inmates? does it, again I ask, speak the truth? Does your Excellency coincide in the the term RARE, as applicable to the case?

Were those entries of such a nature as to be met by the flippant observation of the Inspector when they were about to be read, "We lose so much time" (page 21), and the other equally flippant observation, "The whole question now was, whether Mr. Kelly or Mr. Bodkin was the best judge of meat"! Well, in my mind, might the unfortunate inmates, had they the power to reason, pray your Excellency to save them from a protector, who, under the circumstances, would seek to dispose of *such* a case by *such* an observation.

I have now to call your Excellency's particular attention to the following fact:—

Being assured that interlineations had been made in the resolutions after the mayor had signed them, after the meeting had broken up, and all the governors but one had departed, I was strongly advised to examine them, and I proceeded to the asylum for the purpose.

The 1st resolution was produced to me, and interlineations appeared. I copied it, letting the interlineations appear on the copy as in the original; I then applied for the 2nd resolution; it was not to be found. I was asked if it would answer me to see a copy of it, and I said not. Again the search was renewed, unsuccessfully. Again I was asked would it not satisfy me to see a copy of it, and I said nothing but the original would satisfy me—and not until then was the original produced, and then it proved to be in the handwriting of the governor, who had been chairman of the meeting of the *2nd of July*, when the enquiry *without notice* was gone into.

On referring to the 1st resolution, as taken down by the reporter of the *Limerick Chronicle*, who had left the room when the meeting broke up, I found it to *correspond* with the copy I had made, *if without the interlineations*, and thus was *the truth* of the *information* I had *received confirmed*.

Dr. Nugent's expected report not having reached the Board at the meeting for February, I decided on no longer deferring to allude to the matter of the *interlineations*. I did so, and the circular which I addressed to the governors, who are named, and their replies (of which I annex copies for your Excellency's information), tended to further confirm the correctness of the information I received, inasmuch as the *two members of the Board*, who were stated to me to have *remained* after the Board *had broken up*, are the only persons who have *not denied* their having any knowledge of the interlineations.

I annex a copy of the resolution, as it appeared two days after the enquiry. Your Excellency will see the words "*fully and as represented*" are introduced to render the resolution even more *pointed* and *stringent* than it originally stood.

That an official document has been tampered with in this case there can be no doubt.

Whether it took place to a greater or a lesser extent, I contend it matters but little, for the act is in itself disreputable. If such a course is permitted to pass with impunity, what man is safe? The greater or lesser, the act of delinquency will merely depend upon the *extent* of the *scruples*—or the *fears*—or the *daring*—of the actors.

The matter is now before your Excellency. I am assured that indisputable evidence can be given as to who were privy to the act.

Since the foregoing was written, the scene in the "Yelverton Case" where Chief Justice Monaghan alludes to the letter addressed to him, signed, "A Juror," has come before the public,—all the jurors disclaim the act promptly, fearlessly, *unequivocally*, and thank the Chief Justice for the opportunity he afforded *them* to disclaim it.

Your Excellency will perceive (notwithstanding the length of this letter) that I have as much as possible confined myself, for the present, to matters bearing on *the framing of the two resolutions*—and the *conduct of the Inspector*—for, while those resolutions continue as it were *a brand upon me*, it is quite impossible I could be expected to take my seat at the Board, notwithstanding four of the governors, who were reported as being present and *unanimously* passing them, in a day or two after the enquiry proffered me their hand, but which I declined—on the plea that I could not permit them to contaminate themselves, by coming in contact with a person, whom they had so short a time before *virtually pronounced as a perjurer*, until he should be purged of the imputation. One of them even went so far as to suggest I should call for a fresh enquiry, and named a person whom I should examine to prove my statement. My belief is that *they were surprised* into the resolutions, and I think the facts I have put forward warrant the conclusion.

Your Excellency in the *Maryborough case*—pronounced upon the conduct of *two paid* officials. In the *Limerick case*—your Excellency has as yet pronounced upon *no official*—*paid* or *unpaid*.

From the facts I have detailed, and the report of the proceedings, your Excellency will now be in a position to pronounce in the *Limerick case*.

Whether Dr. Nugent merited the praises he bestowed upon himself, for the manner in which he conducted the *first* enquiry in the *Limerick* case—as see his opening speech?

Whether, from the manner in which he conducted the *first* enquiry, he was the *fitting person* to have conducted the *late* enquiry?

Whether, after what has *come out* upon the *two* enquiries, he has shown himself *worthy of the confidence, either of the government, or the public?*

Whether, after a dispassionate review of the facts I have brought under your Excellency's notice—the finding of the Board of governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum—as led by Dr. Nugent on the 17th of December, 1860, should be quashed—or stand a record in the books of Dublin Castle, against,

Your Excellency's obedient and humble servant,
D. J. WILSON.

CIRCULAR TO GOVERNORS, &c., &c.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, February 5th, 1861.

SIR,

In the monthly meeting of the Board, held on yesterday at the Lunatic Asylum, the Hon. Mr. Spring Rice in the Chair—the only three governors present who had taken part in the proceedings of the 17th of December; viz.—Dr. Gibson, Wm. Howley, and Mr. Hartigan,—on being applied to by me—disclaimed being parties to the interlineations made in the 1st resolution—after it had been signed by the Mayor as chairman.

I shall feel obliged by your intimating to me, whether, in communicating with the government, I am authorized in adding your name to those of the other governors who have disclaimed the act.

I have the honour to be, &c., &c.,

D. J. WILSON.

Copies sent to John Singleton, Henry Maunsel, Thomas Boyce, J. W. Mahony, Esqs.

Quinville Abbey, February 5th, 1861.

SIR,

In reply to your letter just received, I beg to say that I have no knowledge of the interlineations to which you refer—nor of what resolution you allude to—therefore it would be impossible for me to authorize you to name me as a disclaimer to what I was not aware had any existence.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed),

JOHN SINGLETON.

D. J. Wilson, Esq.

Belvoir, February 6th, 1861.

SIR,

I am in receipt of your reply to my note of yesterday, which is most satisfactory, for it not only disclaims all knowledge of the interlineations to which my note referred—but of the resolution to which I alluded as having been interlined after it had been signed by the Mayor as chairman of the meeting held at the Lunatic Asylum on the 17th December.

Strange that the persons reported in three Limerick papers as being

the proposers of the only two resolutions which were passed—should now be in the same catagory—Mr. Boyce having, on the steps at Cruise's, in the presence of several persons, denied being the proposer, or having any knowledge of the 2nd resolution, of the ORIGINAL of which, (but after considerable delay) I succeeded in obtaining a sight at the Asylum.

I have the honour to be your obedient servant,

(Signed),

D. J. WILSON.

John Singleton, Esq., Quinville Abbey, Quin.

6th February, 1861.

MY DEAR WILSON,

You may be perfectly satisfied that I never interlined any document whatsoever at the Lunatic Asylum, or anywhere else.

Yours truly, &c.,

(Signed),

HENRY MAUNSELL.

Spring Fort, Limerick, February 9th.

SIR,

I received your note, and inform you, I know nothing about the first resolution you allude to, as I was not present.

Your obedient servant,

THOMAS BOYCE.

D. J. Wilson, Esq., Belvoir.

Belvoir, February 12th, 1861.

SIR,

Enclosed is a copy of a note which I addressed to those governors of the Limerick Lunatic Asylum who attended the enquiry on the 17th December, and who were not present at the monthly meeting on Monday, the 4th instant.

That addressed to you was posted at Sixmile Bridge on the 7th instant. I have received replies from all the governors except yourself. I now beg to know whether my note reached you.

I remain your obedient servant,

D. J. WILSON.

J. W. Mahony, Esq., Tontine Buildings, Limerick.

Limerick, 13th February, 1861.

SIR,

I did not answer your first letter until I had an opportunity of seeing resolution referred to.

I cannot comprehend the aim nor object of your enquiry, about which I shall not enter into any correspondence, but shall at the Board refer to the matter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. W. MAHONY.

D. J. Wilson, Esq., Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge.

February 14th, 1861.

SIR,

I am in receipt of your note of yesterday. It does not appear that any

of the other governors to whom I wrote deemed it necessary to see the resolutions before giving a prompt disclaimer to being parties to the interlineations referred to.

You say you cannot comprehend the aim or object of my enquiry. I'll tell you, sir—to endeavour to come at the truth—and fix upon the right person, or persons, what I consider a most unjustifiable proceeding—if not something more.

You say you shall not enter into any correspondence on the subject—implying that I seek to draw you into one—which I disclaim: neither of my notes to you warranted such a conclusion. If I had that object in view, you had it in your power to defeat it—by promptly giving—or withholding—your assent to the disclaimer.

You say you will, at the next Board, refer to the matter, when, it is more than probable, I shall not be present. Besides, after the late enquiry, I am more fortified than ever in my preference for *documentary* over *oral* testimony; and I also feel I have already (awaiting Dr. Nugent's promised report, within forty-eight hours from the day of the enquiry, but which, it would appear by a communication from government, has not yet been presented) remained too long silent under the imputation put upon me by the resolution referred to.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

D. J. WILSON.

J. W. Mahony, Esq., Tontine, Limerick.

Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, February 26th, 1861.

SIR,

Before making my intended communication to the government, I deem it right to put you in possession of the accompanying circular to which I have received replies, in order to give you an opportunity of disclaiming the having made any of those interlineations referred to yourself—or sanctioned their being made by any other person.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

D. J. WILSON.

John Nugent, Esq., M.D., Inspector of
Lunatic Asylums, Dublin Castle.
O.H.M.S. Immediate.

Dublin Castle, February 28th.

SIR,

I have been favoured with the letter addressed by you to me, and bearing date February the 28th, instant.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN NUGENT.

D. J. Wilson, Esq., &c., &c.

Dublin Castle, 29th March, 1861.

SIR,

In answer to the various papers submitted to the Lord Lieutenant by Mr. Wilson, herewith appended, and having reference to investigations

at the Limerick Asylum, I shall endeavour to place before you the facts of the case as succinctly as possible, for the information of his Excellency.

I may first, however, premise that I am utterly at a loss to divine any cause on my part, for the pertinacious acerbity with which Mr. Wilson has thought proper, for the last eight or nine months, to impugn my motives and my conduct in the public press.

To render the subject of communication more intelligible, I shall commence from a definite point.

On the 4th of June, 1860, at a meeting of the Board of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, the governors present being the Mayor, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Gibson, J.P., Mr. Spaight, J.P., Mr. Hartigan, J.P., Mr. Mahony, J.P., and Mr. Wilson, the last-named gentleman made some observations in regard to the meat contractor, and the quality of the articles supplied by him. A general conversation ensued thereon; but no resolution was proposed by Mr. Wilson, neither did his remarks originate from any resolution then before the meeting. Notice of motion, however, was given for the next Board-day to admit the press, of which motion Mr. Wilson was the seconder.

On the 8th of June, Mr. Wilson did himself the honour of writing to the Lord Lieutenant as a simple member of the Board, and without the cognizance of a single governor as to his intention.

In his letter he referred to the proceedings of the Board generally, and to himself and to two other governors, but in rather vague language.

That letter was sent to the Inspectors for a report thereon. I attended the next meeting, on the 2nd of July, at the Limerick Asylum, when both from the tenor of his communication to the Lord Lieutenant, and from the fact of his being the seconder of an important resolution, to be discussed that day, I expected to have met Mr. Wilson, but he did not appear, neither did he intimate his intention not to be present. I expressed regret at his absence, when one of the governors said he had been told that Mr. Wilson had gone to England the week before.

Nevertheless I brought the subject of Mr. Wilson's letter cursorily before the Board, consisting of the Mayor, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Howley, Mr. Maunsel, Mr. Mahony, etc., etc., when I was informed that the question had been already discussed and there was no use in referring further to it. However, as I had previously sent for the contractor for my own information, I examined him very fully before the Board.

With regard to the result of my enquiry, I beg to refer to the annexed report of the 7th of July, in which I am sure I spoke, or at least I wished to speak, of Mr. Wilson in any but uncourteous terms.

Subsequent to this meeting, Mr. Wilson commenced a series of semi-official letters, not composed, perhaps, in that spirit or with that taste one might expect from an educated gentleman.

But to proceed with the monthly meetings.

He attended the Board in August; but would take no part in its proceedings, as he had not heard in reply to his letter to the Lord Lieutenant.

He did not attend the September meeting; but forwarded a notice of motion for the next Board.

He did not attend in October: he wrote, however, on this occasion to have his motion postponed.

Mr. Wilson was present at the meeting on the 5th of November, the

governors present being the Right Hon. Mr. Monsel, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hartigan, Mr. Ryan, and Mr. Mahony, when, in consequence of Mr. Wilson making a distinct charge involving the characters of two officers particularly in the asylum, "It was resolved that one or both of the Inspectors be requested to appoint an early day to investigate on oath charges made by Mr. Wilson."

The earliest day consistent with the convenience of Mr. Wilson himself, as well as of other parties, that could be named, was the 17th of December.

I attended on that occasion at 12 o'clock. Before me in the Board-room I found Mr. Wilson seated at a side-table with three reporters. Subsequently the following governors attended:—the Mayor in the Chair, Mr. Howley, D.L., Mr. Singleton, D.L., Mr. Mahony, J.P., Mr. Gibson, J.P., Mr. Maunsel, J.P., Mr. Boyce, J.P., and Mr. Hartigan.

It was proposed that in accordance with rule, that the press should be excluded, but I submitted that as grave accusations had been promulgated against officers attached to the institution, the evidence, be what it might, should get equal publicity.

Now with regard to the resolutions. They were adopted after an enquiry on oath that lasted over four hours, and during which, while anxious to act with the strictest impartiality towards the accuser and accused, I treated Mr. Wilson with marked respect.

On his leaving the room, in which as governor he had been requested to remain, the members one and all unanimously expressed their conviction that no evidence was given in support of the charges advanced by Mr. Wilson.

I was requested to put a resolution to the above effect in form. I did so, precisely as it is given. I read the first paragraph, which bore simply on the result of the investigation.

The second paragraph of the resolution emanated from me; to me alone is its introduction to be attributed. It thus occurred. I observed, that although most uncourteous, and not very complimentary to the governors themselves, in order to avoid the semblance of being personal to Mr. Wilson, it might be as well, as he happened not to be on over-cordial terms with some members of the Board, to give him credit for the best intentions. Mr. Howley and Mr. Maunsel expressed a full approval, the other gentlemen present generally assenting. Two members, however, thought my good feelings would be likely to meet with an unsatisfactory return.

The 2nd resolution *was drawn up* and written by Mr. Singleton towards the close of the enquiry, and handed round while I was examining a witness. It owed its origin, I am fully aware, not so much to any merit of mine as to a sentiment among honourable men, such as were those assembled, that a public officer in the discharge of his duty should be protected from unmerited aspersions, and I therefore could not but feel gratified that, although for the two proceeding years I had been in direct antagonism with every member of the Limerick Board on a subject in regard to which they entertained strong opinions, our differences had not diminished a long and mutual cordiality.

The resolutions as annexed were forwarded to the Under Secretary, with a letter from the mayor—a gentleman who commands the respect of

all his fellow-citizens—and thus the very medium of their transmission stamps them with authenticity.

Mr. Wilson pays a very indifferent compliment to him, to two deputy-lieutenants, and five magistrates presiding in Courts of Justice, when he would imply—so at least I read it—that they were all under my influence and control.

Mr. Wilson merely insinuates that there was really no authority for the late investigation, but surely he cannot forget that it originated in his own letter to the Lord Lieutenant, on which the Inspectors were desired to report, 7th of July, 1860; that he himself went to the asylum at the next monthly meeting in August, to enquire after the report; that in September he gave notice of motion with reference to it; that in October he had his motion deferred; that on the 5th of November he attended the Board, when, the question being still in abeyance, in consequence of definite charges advanced by him, the governors sought an enquiry *on oath*; that at the end of November, or early in December, he called on Sir Thomas Larcom, the representative of the Executive, for the purpose of having the investigation deferred, as he was going to England; and that, finally, he attended with his own reporter at the Board on the 17th of December.

It is idle for Mr. Wilson to attempt to escape from his own acts. He made charges which were not substantiated.

Without imputing to him a single unworthy motive—on the contrary, willing to give Mr. Wilson ample credit for good intentions as regards the Limerick Asylum, I think his time, his pen, and his money could be much better employed than in assailing a public officer whose sole ambition is to fulfil his duty.

I have the honour to be, &c., &c.

(Signed),

JOHN NUGENT.

Sir Thomas Larcom, K.C.B.

Dublin Castle, 5th April, 1861.

SIR,

I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th ult., with its accompanying representations relative to an investigation held at the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum. And I am desired to acquaint you that his Excellency has considered your communication, together with a statement in reply by Dr. Nugent—but his Excellency does not feel called on to take any further steps in the matter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS LARCOM.

D. J. Wilson, Esq., Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge.

Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge, April 7th, 1861.

MY LORD,

A letter from the Under-Secretary of the 5th, received this morning, intimates that your Excellency, in reference to the investigation lately held at the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum, has considered my communications, together with a statement in reply by Dr. Nugent; but that

your Excellency does not feel called on to take any further steps in the matter.

As under these circumstances I suppose I am to assume Dr. Nugent's reply has proved satisfactory to your Excellency, may I hope your Excellency will be pleased to order I shall be permitted to see it—when perhaps it may prove equally convincing and satisfactory to

Your Excellency's obedient and humble servant,
D. J. WILSON.

To the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle,
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Dublin Castle, 12th April, 1861.

SIR,

Agreeably to the request contained in your letter of the 7th inst. I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit to you herewith a copy of Dr. Nugent's report of the 29th March.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
THOMAS LARCOM.

D. J. Wilson, Belvoir, Sixmile Bridge.

To the Right Hon. the Earl Carlisle,
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Belvoir, August, 1861.

MY LORD,

I have been favoured, by directions of your Excellency, with a copy of what purports to be a reply from Dr. Nugent, to the various papers which I had the honour to submit to your Excellency on the 15th of March; connected with the Limerick Lunatic Asylum—and for which I have to express my thanks, as it puts me in possession of the grounds on which your Excellency came to the conclusion,—“that it was not necessary to take any further steps in the matter.”

Whether it is your Excellency who has come to this conclusion, or whether the matter was referred to the Under Secretary to deal with, I am of course in ignorance—in either case I dissent from it. But, while I feel it fully bears out the intimation conveyed in my letter to your Excellency of the 7th of November, 1860,—“that the course pursued towards me precluded the hope of redress”—I also feel it due to myself not to allow Dr. Nugent's statements to pass unnoticed, lest it might be supposed they could not be refuted.

Dr. Nugent, after promising to place facts before your Excellency, proceeds to say,—“he is totally at a loss to divine any cause for (what he is pleased to term) the ‘pertinacious acerbity’ with which I had thought proper, for the last eight or nine months, to impugn his motives and his conduct in the public press.” Rather a bold assertion, even for Dr. Nugent, when we take into account his admitted acuteness, and that the two letters which I felt it necessary to write to the press, 25th of July and 21st December, and my statement before the Board on the 17th of December, were generally considered as speaking in very plain terms,—and I did not think I spoke in vague terms, when giving my opinion of Dr. Nugent's conduct, in my letter to your Excellency of the 15th of March.

Dr. Nugent (omitting what occurred, when my attention was first

directed to the complaints in the provision report-book by Mr. Hartigan and Mr. Mahony, but which are not now to be found in it) commences his statement with the 4th of June, 1860—names the governors who were present on that day—"says that I made some observations as to the meat contractor, and quality of the article supplied, that a general conversation ensued, but no resolution was proposed by Mr. Wilson, nor did his remarks arise from any resolution then before the meeting,—but notice was given as to admitting the press, and seconded by Mr. Wilson."

It is quite true the "some observations" alluded to by Dr. Nugent as being made by me, did *not* grow out of any *resolution*—but it is *not true* that they occurred *casually*, as Dr. Nugent would lead your Excellency to suppose—for they arose from a formal *notice* given by me on the 25th of May, 1860, "that I would at the next meeting, call attention to a matter arising out of the discussion which took place at the last meeting of the Board, connected with entries in the report-book, in reference to the meat contract"—and I did call attention to, and detailed, what had occurred, and what I had said at the two former meetings,—and the Board unanimously admitted the correctness of my statement.

Dr. Nugent observes, "My remarks originated from *no resolution* before the Board." True; but, My Lord, if they *did originate* from the *formal notice* I have before alluded to—*issued from the Asylum both in a written and printed form*, and duplicates of which I hold—if that affirmative fact, is suppressed by the official called on to report; while he puts forward a negative fact, tending to mislead.—

Does such a course of proceeding meet your Excellency's approval? Is it likely to enable your Excellency to arrive at the truth?

Is it worthy of a person holding Dr. Nugent's situation? Is it deserving of the protection of the Executive?

Dr. Nugent proceeds to charge me with "writing to your Excellency as a simple member of the Board, without the cognizance of a single governor."

I did, as a simple member of the Board, write an official letter to your Excellency. Not in consequence of anything which had occurred at the meeting, and which I thought had set all matters connected with the meat contract at rest—but in consequence of a paid government official, acting as I considered in a most improper manner towards me, in the public market-place, immediately after the meeting—and for which act of writing to your Excellency, I do not feel myself accountable to Dr. Nugent, or any other person whatsoever.

If I did write in vague terms, as Dr. Nugent asserts—what becomes of his assertion at the investigation in December, "that I made charges "against two officers of the establishment, and that they were in the "books of Dublin Castle, appearing against them.

It is not the fact, as stated by Dr. Nugent, "that I referred to *two* other governors, and myself." I referred but to *one*.—See my letter of 8th June, 1860.

It is not the fact, as stated by Dr. Nugent, "that I was seated at a table with *three* reporters." I sat only with the *one* I had engaged; the other two sat together, at another end of the room.

It is not a fact, as stated by Dr. Nugent, "that I was the only governor in the room when he entered it"—there were certainly *two*, I think, *three* others there beside myself—all these matters of no moment in themselves,

but material, as showing the unfortunate absence of accuracy in a public servant.

Again, although so often disposed of, does Dr. Nugent attempt to mystify, with regard to the holding of the enquiry of the 2nd July, behind the back of the person who applied for it.

The enquiry then about to be held, was considered by the Inspector, either of an important character, or it was not. If he considered it of an important nature—why not, as I before stated, cause notice to be given to the person—who he says brought charges—that he might be prepared with his proofs—does a judge call on a cause, not set down for hearing?

Why not cause notice to be given in the monthly summons to the several governors—the jurors? Where notice was deemed necessary, when the cleansing of a sewer was to be brought under consideration (see Notice, 4th April, '60) or the mending the shoes of the inmates (see Notice, 2nd August, '60) and where a *special* meeting of the governors is called for the 16th of July, 1860—although the monthly meeting for August is close at hand—"to consider the application of Mr. Ahern, requesting to have his wife permitted to remain some time longer in the Asylum," one would suppose that an order from your Excellency, "to institute an enquiry into imputations of a grave nature, against two officers of the establishment," (we are not told what they were) would have been entitled to equal consideration, and the issuing of at least, an equal notice—as to the cleansing of a sewer, and mending of shoes.

On the other hand let us suppose the matter to be enquired into, not to be of sufficient importance to require a notice.

Why did not Dr. Nugent postpone the enquiry, until he could have the attendance of the person who had applied for it, and was competent to give evidence—whose absence both he, and the governors regretted, and who he stated in his report, was absent on *important* business?

Notwithstanding my absence, Dr. Nugent says "he cursorily brought the matter before the Board, when he was informed the matter had been already disposed of, and there was no use in further referring to it." Now the matter which caused me to apply to your Excellency was, as before stated—viz., the attack on me by the resident physician in the Market Place, after the meeting of the 4th of June, and after, as I thought, the contract affair was set at rest—had never been before the Board—had never been alluded to by me to any governor, and was (as far as I am aware) unknown to anyone connected with the Asylum, except the visiting physician—consequently had never been disposed of.

Dr. Nugent refers to his report of the 7th of July as the result of his enquiry, and "the courteous terms in which he spoke, or wished to speak, of Mr. Wilson." Of the *terms* in which I was spoken of in that report I could *not* complain—of the *act* of holding the enquiry behind my back, while the report states I was away on *important* business, I *did* and *do* complain.

Dr. Nugent proceeds to say, "I attended the meeting in August, but would take no part in the proceedings, as I had not heard in reply to my letter to the Lord Lieutenant." Although the minute book assigns this cause, it is another case of misrepresentation—for I had at that time received, in reply to my letter to your Excellency, two letters from the Under Secretary, sending me copies of the report of 7th of July. But I

did refuse to take part in the proceedings until, Dr. Nugent's report [he admits, near the conclusion of his letter, I went to enquire for it at the monthly meeting in August] should be officially before the Board, that I might question the governors present on the 2nd of July if they—as Dr. Nugent would lead your Excellency to suppose—had acquiesced in it. That was really my reason—and I gave it at the time—for taking no part in the proceedings in August.

Dr. Nugent says I did not attend the meeting in September, but forwarded a notice of motion for the next Board—another misrepresentation, on the part of the government officer—I did not in September send a notice for the next Board—and the reasons why I did not attend in September, was because a notice which I had given on the 22nd of August, (when I found no copy of the Report had been sent to the Board) was cushioned, and did not appear in the summons for September. And I stated this by letter to the chairman—and by his own showing, Dr. Nugent had this notice and letter before him, when he made this assertion. (See Notice and Letter, 3rd September, '60, pages 13 and 15.)

Dr. Nugent says “I did not attend in October, but wrote on this occasion to have my notice postponed”—another misrepresentation—for according to his own showing, Dr. Nugent had my letter before him when he deliberately made this assertion.

I not only did *not* write to have a notice of motion *postponed*, but I did write to the late Mayor, *abandoning it*—and saying “that I had decided to abstain from putting myself forward as an accuser—where officials were—apparently—if not absolutely determined to cushion or protect.” See my letter of the 21st September, page 15.

Dr. Nugent says “I was present at the meeting on the 5th of November—this *is* true. I had issued a circular to the several governors present at the meeting in July, to say I would on that day, give them an opportunity of assenting to, or dissenting from, Dr. Nugent's Report. And when they saw the list of entries of *complaints*, produced by me—as contrasted with Dr. Nugent's term *rare*—dissent was the order of the day—and “back they all recoiled.” In Dr. Nugent's account of what occurred at the meeting, all this is omitted, though I directed attention to it in my letter of the 15th of March—but I suppose I am to take it for granted, the omission arose, not from design, but purely from accident. He proceeds to say, that “in consequence of my making a distinct charge involving the character of two officers, particularly *within* the asylum, it was resolved, that one or both the Inspectors—be requested to appoint an early day to investigate on oath charges made by Mr. Wilson.”

What *really* did occur, is so fully set out in the letters at pages 17, 18, and 19 of the Report, which I had the honor to forward to your Excellency—that I shall not here repeat it.

How Dr. Nugent, with the account of that day's proceeding before him, which he heard me read, without a single dissent, from any of the governors, could, (unless presuming on your Excellency's not having read the Report, or that his reply would be disposed of, without being submitted to your Excellency) how I say—he could have the hardihood to put forward such a version of what had really occurred, will to others, or I am much mistaken, appear as rather extraordinary.

In proceeding to give an account of the opening of the investigation of

the 17th December, Dr. Nugent says "it was proposed the press should be excluded." This is *true*, but he proceeds to say "he submitted, that as grave accusations had been promulgated against officers attached to the Institution, the evidence, be it what it might, should get equal publicity."

It is painful to take from Dr. Nugent, the slightest ground for self-laudation—but on this occasion I feel that I am the person entitled to credit, for the admission of the press, and the evidence being taken on oath—in as much, as I had previously to the Inspectors themselves, (see page 18-19) and more than once before the Board—distinctly stated, I would give no further evidence unless on those conditions—and I acted on it on the 5th of November.

Dr. Nugent says "the resolutions were adopted after an enquiry on oath, that lasted four hours, and during which time—while anxious to act with the strictest impartiality towards accuser and accused, he treated Mr. Wilson with marked respect."

Dr. Nugent is here again so pleased with himself, that it is a pity to mar his self-satisfaction by assuring him that his standard for "*marked respect*" was on this occasion in others eyes—as well as mine—considered a very low one. And that his standard for "*strict impartiality*"—judging from his attack on me, in his opening speech, was not considered a very high one—while his demeanor during the time, I was reading my statement—by yawning—throwing himself back in his chair—turning over the leaves of a book, so *noisily* (especially while I was reading the entries which did not appear at all to please)—that I had more than once to request his attention. While quitting his seat—and throwing up his skirts at the fire—were among the specimens of marked respect, which I on that occasion received from Dr. Nugent—for which he claims credit—and for which I freely acknowledge myself his debtor.

Dr. Nugent proceeds to say, "I quitted the room, though requested to remain, when the members one and all, unreservedly expressed their conviction, that no evidence was given in support of the charges, advanced by Mr. Wilson."

Dr. Nugent's memory appears to have failed him so very frequently, in matters of which I had cognizance—that bearing in mind *every* one of the governors present on the 2nd of July, 1860, *dissented* from the *only*, but the most material statement in Dr. Nugent's report of the proceedings of that day, to which I called their attention—he will pardon me for not placing implicit reliance, on the accuracy of the statement he now makes, viz:—"that the members one and all unreservedly expressed their conviction that *no evidence* was given in support of the charges advanced by Mr. Wilson,"—and I do so, for the following reasons:—

Because Dr. Gibson advised me to apply for another enquiry, and to examine a person whom he named; and whom I at the time named to several.

Because Mr. Boyce denied his having any part in the resolutions.

Because Dr. Gibson, Mr. Maunsel, Mr. Howley, and Mr. Boyce—who, when I declined to accept their hands, on the ground that they would be contaminated by coming in contact with one, whom their resolution had pronounced a perjurer—each individually declared—I *well knew they believed me incapable of such an act*. And if they who so addressed me, heard me *deliberately and positively swear*, that I had seen the entries referred to—I

would respectfully ask your Excellency, if that was not *some* evidence of the fact to which I had deposed. And if they heard me swear I attracted the clerk's attention to the entries, and if they heard the clerk admit I said to him, "that he at least appeared to be doing his duty;" and if they heard me swear that on the 5th November, 1860, I asked the clerk, in presence of the assembled Board on that day—*whether I had not pointed out certain entries to him, at a certain time*—which were not then to be seen; and if they heard me swear, that the clerk distinctly admitted to me, on the 5th of November, that I had so pointed them out to him; I would ask, if that was not *some* evidence of the fact to which I had deposed.

And if Mr. Maunsel, Mr. Hartigan, and Mr. Mahony—on the 17th of December—in answer to a query from me, admitted that they heard me distinctly put that question to the clerk, on the 5th November—and if each in turn admitted—*that the clerk DID NOT THEN DENY that I had pointed out the entries to him at the time I stated*; I would respectfully ask your Excellency to pronounce if that was not *some* evidence, in support of what I had stated. And if on referring to the report-book, as it now stands—of the several entries of complaints, to which Mr. Hartigan and Mr. Mahony attracted my attention, and to which, I in the discharge of my duty (unfortunately as it has turned out) directed the attention of the Board—but a *solitary* entry now remains to be seen—and if of the entry to which I referred, as having an interlineation coming on the signature of the clerk (and referred to in Mr. Hartigan's evidence) *no* trace is now to be seen; and if as before stated, for *eleven* consecutive weeks—viz., from the 29th of August to the 12th of November, 1859, in violation of a distinct *order* of the Inspector, Dr. Nugent, *not a single entry*, appears in the report-book, with regard to *any* contractor—while *fifteen* appear in the *seven* antecedent, and *thirteen* in the *six* following weeks, and *none* for July, August, September, 1860, I would ask—whether the immediate foregoing, and (if documents remain as they were) incontrovertible facts—coupled with those preceding them—do, or do not afford, *some* evidence in support of my statement to the Board on the 5th of November, viz:—that entries to which I had pointed attention on the latter end of August, 1860, are not now to be seen?

Dr. Nugent proceeds to state, he was requested to draw up a resolution in form, to the effect "that there was no evidence, and he did so precisely as it is given, and he read the first paragraph, which bore simply on the result of the investigation."

How does all this, I would ask, which it is stated occurred *after* I left the room, correspond with *the facts*—that *before* I left the room, I heard enquiry made by Dr. Nugent for the resolution,—and by a reporter and one of the governors for "*the resolution Dr. Nugent had drawn up*," and which it appeared had been mislaid.

Whether the resolution I heard enquired after, and that Dr. Nugent refers to, were one and the same, far be it from me to say, as I have no proof—but there stands the fact, that I heard a resolution, which it was stated had been drawn up by Dr. Nugent, enquired for, and saw it searched for, *before* I left the room,—and consequently *before* the governors had been called on to pronounce their opinion!!

Dr. Nugent says, "the 2nd paragraph of the resolution emanated from him, and to him alone was its introduction to be attributed."

How unfortunate that its origin should have been, on more than one occasion, *previously* claimed by Mr. Singleton—and again *for* Mr. Singleton *at his own instance and by letter*, and that since the receipt by me of Dr. Nugent's letter to the Under Secretary,—notwithstanding the Inspector so circumstantially lays claim to the bantling—as being entirely of his own begetting.

Between the two gentlemen I must leave it, as I did the previous contradiction in reference to me before the Board—between Mr. Hartigan and the Resident Physician. It is, however, but fair to say, the paragraph appears to be in Mr. Singleton's writing.

Dr. Nugent *considerately* refers to “my being on not over-cordial terms with some members of the Board,” as the cause for his *kindly* feeling in proposing the paragraph. Now, it so happened, of all the governors Dr. Nugent named as being present—that Mr. Singleton was the only one with whom I was not on terms. Strange that Mr. Singleton and Dr. Nugent, (whose feeling towards me was so fully portrayed in his opening address,) should (as if now ashamed of their respective parts in the antecedent paragraph) be each for himself, claiming credit for originating this *palliative* paragraph; which with its *damnatory* precursor staring me in the face, I considered such an insult to the individual to whom it alluded, and to common sense—that I repudiated it, ere I knew of its being claimed by either of the gentlemen.

Thus, the two governors, who Dr. Nugent states, “anticipated an unsatisfactory return,” showed their penetration, in giving me credit for appreciating such a production as it deserved, on the score of *consolation*,—though sensibly alive to its value, in rendering the resolution as a *whole*,—into something approaching the incomprehensible, or superlatively ridiculous.

Dr. Nugent says, “the second resolution was drawn up, and written “by Mr. Singleton towards the close of the enquiry, and handed round, “while he was examining a witness.” This was the resolution which I found such a difficulty in obtaining a sight of at the Asylum, of which I was offered to be shown a copy, but of which I persevered in requiring to be shown the original, when it turned out to be in the hand-writing of Mr. Singleton.

I am loath under present circumstances, to make any allusion to Mr. Singleton; but when it is borne in mind that, for acting in the discharge of what I merely deemed my duty, and presuming to question the course pursued towards me, by officials—I have been subjected to a most vexatious and harrassing opposition, and the grossest misrepresentation*—and

* For instance, the accuracy of some complaints which had been made to me on matters connected with the admission of Clare patients being questioned, I intimated I would in future bring no case before the Board except it was in writing; and I did bring forward two, I think, from Sir Burton McNamara, one or two from Dr. Cullinan—an *extract* from one of Dr. Cullinan's letters which I read at the Board (referring to a patient, and various matters connected with the institution), was sent to him by the Resident Physician on the 14th of June, 1860; and on my return from England, I received from the Resident Physician a copy of a letter which he had received from Dr. Cullinan in reply to the extract sent him—and in which Dr. Cullinan admitted he had been in error, as to the case in which he had called my attention. This letter from Dr. Cullinan had been shown about, and as a passage in it stated, that Dr. Cullinan's letter to me—“was not intended for public perusal, and expressed surprise

when it is also borne in mind, that by a resolution of the board, I have virtually been pronounced as having sworn falsely, and when it is further borne in mind that your Excellency has not upon the grounds which I placed before your Excellency, deemed yourself called on to remove the stain upon me, as recorded in the books at Dublin Castle, I have no other alternative than to tamely submit to bear the brand—or to put forward the facts of the case, in its various bearings,—and leave the public to draw its own conclusion.

It was the general opinion, (and even of some of his own friends), that Mr. Singleton should not—considering our relative positions—have taken a part in the investigation.

Dr. Nugent proceeds—and assuming for the time, the garb of the “first of Christian virtues”—“is fully aware Mr. Singleton’s originating the resolution arose, not so much from Dr. Nugent’s merits, as from a sentiment, that a public officer, in discharge of his duty, should be protected from unmerited aspersion.” Now, as Mr. Singleton sat beside Dr. Nugent at the investigation—and as they were frequently in close, and confidential communication during the time—it is quite possible Mr. Singleton may have conveyed to Dr. Nugent those reasons for originating the resolution—I thought it might be possible, that Dr. Nugent said to Mr. Singleton, “this man’s persevering to read the entries of complaints, has so completely contradicted my report, that coupled with my holding the inquiry at the meeting of July, (of which by the way you were chairman) behind his back, will tell so much against me, that unless you stick to your friend, and draw up, and pass a vote of confidence in me—I am regularly done—and the passing of that, and the resolution which I have drawn up, will—if we can accomplish it—effectually put an extinguisher on the matter. Besides resolutions appearing to emanate from the body of the Governors will have great weight, and save me, not only from the consequences of

and regret that it should have been read for the Board by Mr. Wilson,” it may be easily imagined, what an impression it could make, if shown about for a month, during my absence.

On my placing the *entire of his original* letter before Dr. Cullinan, and reminding him of the circumstances which drew it forth, and showing him how necessary it was I should be in a position to set myself right with the Board, and with the public—he frankly admitted the justice of my application—said he would write to me—did write the following letter—which I read for the Board—and now give to the public:—

Ennis, August 18th, 1861.

My Dear Sir,

I have heard with much surprise that it was insinuated, or that it could be imagined, that you committed a breach of confidence, by submitting to the Governors of the Asylum, a letter which I lately wrote to you, requesting you to obtain for me some returns connected with the Asylum.

There was nothing in this letter itself, or in the communications which took place between us on the subject to which it related, which could invest it with a *confidential* character. When writing to you, it did not occur to me, that you would lay my letter before the Board, but I never had the least objection to your doing so; and now I am glad you acted as you did, inasmuch as it has afforded me an opportunity of discovering, and correcting an error, into which I fell inadvertently, as I have already explained to you. I can only repeat that my letter to you was in no way private or confidential, and that of course you were quite at liberty to deal with it as you pleased.

I am, my dear sir, very faithfully yours,

P. CULLINAN.

D. Wilson, Esq.

the last Report—but also from that most ticklish affair—the making another—which from what has come out may involve me still more deeply.”

Whether it was Mr. Singleton’s feelings towards me, that prompted him to propose the condemnatory—and pen the laudatory resolution—or whether he was cajoled into both (I hope it was the latter), I of course cannot presume to say—but in whatever manner the matter was arranged between them—or whether arising from sympathy, without arrangement—your Excellency will perceive, there can be no mistake, and upon their own showing as to the fact—that the resolutions as initialled by the Mayor, were the joint production of a Governor, with whom I was not on terms,—and an Inspector whom I had charged with making a report, which did not adhere to facts—and who in return had arraigned me. Whether either of the gentlemen were exactly the persons to fill the prominent parts which they selected, I leave others to decide.

Dr. Nugent, while alluding to the gratification he felt at Mr. Singleton’s resolution, says, “though he had been in direct antagonism for the two preceding years with every member of the Limerick Board, on a particular subject; their differences had not diminished their mutual cordiality.” Now I venture to say, there was not a single member of the Board worked so cordially,—certainly not more cordially with Dr. Nugent than myself,—up to the receipt of his Report of the 7th of July—in as much as our views so generally, indeed almost invariably, corresponded. And as a proof—the very first statement I heard him make as to the expediency of separating Limerick, and Clare Lunatics—I became a convert to the *principle*—though reserving myself as to the mode in which it was to be accomplished. Up to the so-called enquiry of 2nd of July, I gave Dr. Nugent—what I ever felt bound to give to every public officer, while I thought him discharging his duties faithfully—my humble, but zealous support—but when I thought Dr. Nugent had rendered himself unworthy of it—I did not fail to openly avow—and as openly withdraw it.

Your Excellency will perceive, Dr. Nugent instead of meeting the statement I made as to the interlineations *openly*—ingeniously endeavours to slur it over, by riding off on the high character of the transmittor of the resolutions—The Mayor—“a gentleman commanding the respect of his fellow-citizens, as stamping them with authenticity.” To all that Dr. Nugent says, in praise of the Mayor, I fully subscribe—more, I here renew to him my thanks, for his courtesy; for to him I am indebted for protection from Dr. Nugent’s course of proceedings, on more than one occasion during the investigation. But I do not subscribe to the sequence, that the character of the Mayor, however high, stamps the resolutions he forwarded as authentic—in as much as my letter to the Press, of 21st December, having given an insight as to the interlineation affair—it was deemed necessary to have the Mayor at the next meeting, *to certify as to their correctness*—a circumstance, I believe quite unusual, if not unprecedented—and the Mayor with good sense, and a due regard to his character did *cautiously* certify. The minute was as follows:—

“7th January, 1861.

“Right Worshipful Mayor attended for the purpose of verifying the

resolutions of the 17th of December—and having stated they were *substantially correct*—he was unable to remain for the transaction of business, as he had to attend a meeting of the Limerick Corporation.”

Thus the fact of its being deemed necessary to get the Mayor to verify—and the *nature and terms of his verification*—instead of tending to confirm—do really go to nullify the conclusion Dr. Nugent would so ingeniously seem to establish, viz:—that the resolutions are at present, in the same state, as when initialled by the Mayor, before the meeting broke up. Their transmission by his Worship, will not therefore under the circumstances, get rid of the *pungent interlineations*—nor will it get rid of a letter in my possession from the reporter whom I engaged, which states—“that after the meeting had broken up, when on his way home—having missed his penknife he returned to the Board Room for it—and there found Dr. Nugent, Mr. W. Mahony, Dr. Fitzgerald, the clerk, and that there were also still there two reporters to the local papers. Seeing blotting paper applied to a resolution, he cautioned against interlineations, and when asked to make a copy of the resolutions, as the other reporters were doing—refused to comply—in as much as he said, “he had already a copy of those which had been passed. And, in as much as he intended to tell me, what he had seen, he cautioned the parties, to beware of what they were doing.”

Taking into consideration the state of the first resolution as seen by me on the 22nd December—the denial of any participation in the interlineations by all the governors who were applied to—except Mr. Mahony and Dr. Nugent who gave no denial,—the studiously qualified verification by the Mayor—and the positive testimony of the reporter—I shall be anxious to see whether Dr. Nugent will openly and boldly meet those facts—or again evade them by the mere assertion that the “resolution was put in form by him, precisely as it is given”—and that a personage of high character did forward it.

Dr. Nugent “takes it, I would imply, that the governors present were “under his *influence and control*.” I gave it as my opinion, that they were *surprised* into the resolutions by Dr. Nugent—who, in order to avoid making a report, and give weight to the proceedings, dexterously managed to place upon the Governors’ shoulders, the responsibility which should have been borne on his own—and I am quite free to confess Dr. Nugent’s presence to conduct the enquiry took me by surprise—that his opening address took me, and others by surprise—but that, after his opening address, I ceased to be surprised at any thing he did, or could do in the matter, even though it were to communicate with some of the governors without the Board Room immediately previous to the enquiry.

Dr. Nugent proceeds “Mr. Wilson naively insinuates there was no authority for the late investigation”—Mr. Wilson meant what he stated, and stated what he meant—he wrote to the mayor in September, and also stated on the 5th of November to the same effect—that he would prefer no charges, and gave his reasons—but that he would give evidence if called on—that the summons for December 17th, neither stated the charges, or who was to preside—that it did state that he, Mr. Wilson, who said he would prefer no charges, had preferred charges—and which was not the fact.

Dr. Nugent says, “I cannot well forget, that the enquiry originated in

my own letter to the Lord Lieutenant, on which the Inspectors were directed to report July 7th." I do not forget that letter—I do not forget, that the Under Secretary in acknowledging it, left me in ignorance as to whether its prayer would be granted—I do not forget the preliminaries to the enquiry which followed,—or the report which followed the enquiry. I do not forget the term *rare*—I do not forget that it caused me to see whether it had been truthfully applied, or whether it was a fiction, as contrasted with Dr. Nugent's report—nor do I forget, that the result of my inspection was the entire withdrawal of my confidence in Dr. Nugent as a public servant—nor do I forget it was the inspection of the report-book, that *really* originated the late investigation.

Dr. Nugent says, "I cannot forget my letter to your Excellency"—most certainly not,—for all the reasons already assigned, but for another in addition stronger than all,—at least in my opinion. It brought Dr. Nugent to the meeting of the 2nd of July. In his report of that meeting he states, "it was a subject of regret that Mr. Wilson himself did not attend;" and in Dr. Nugent's opening address on the 17th of December, he says, "he observed to the Board (on the 2nd of July) that he was sorry they had not *his friend* Mr. Wilson there, and that he was much disappointed, and he believed the Board felt so too." *His friend*, Mr. Wilson's absence regretted both by himself and the Governors!! The man's absence regretted *as a friend*, whom he (Dr. Nugent) in the same breath denounced "for having written this same letter behind the backs of those same Governors—conduct unbecoming of any man;"—those same Governors being about to sit in judgment on testimony to be given by the man whom Dr. Nugent thus denounces—but whom Dr. Nugent assures your Excellency he on this very occasion treated with the most marked respect! And the Inspector so much regretted the absence of "his friend" Mr. Wilson, but could not wait for him. Did the regret of Dr. Nugent and the Governors for *his friend* Mr. Wilson's absence, arise from the loss of his evidence, on a matter declared by the Governors (according to Dr. Nugent's statement) *as already disposed of*? Or, was the regret occasioned by the loss of an opportunity on his own part and that of the Governors to arraign "*his friend*" Mr. Wilson—as he would well deserve—if guilty of "conduct unbecoming in any man?" Dr. Nugent will now perceive that I do not, cannot soon forget my letter to your Excellency or its results. Dr. Nugent directed your Excellency's attention to this letter. Whether it has, or has not, drawn forth proofs, of Dr. Nugent's sincerity and consistency, I now leave others to pronounce.

Dr. Nugent states I went to the next monthly meeting, (August,) *to inquire after the report*. This is true, but as it differs from his version of the cause of my attendance in a former part of his letter, both cannot be correct.

Dr. Nugent says that in September, I gave notice of a motion with reference to the report. This is not the fact; I gave no such notice. I did not attend the September meeting, and stated my reason for not doing so, by letters to the Chairman (September 3rd and 21st), at pages 13, 14, 15 of the report I had the honour to forward to your Excellency.

The entry in the minute-book in reference to this letter of the 21st of September, directly at variance with the terms of the letter itself, affords

another specimen of the many difficulties and misrepresentations I have had to contend with.

Dr. Nugent proceeds to state "that in October I had my motion deferred"—another glaring misrepresentation, already disposed of. That on the 5th of November I attended the Board. As Dr. Nugent *forgot* to detail *some* of the proceedings of that day—I have already done so for him.

'Tis true as stated by Dr. Nugent, I did attend on the 17th of December, with my own reporter—not three—had I notice Dr. Nugent was to have presided, I should not have attended.

Dr. Nugent proceeds to say, "it is idle for Mr. Wilson to try to escape the responsibility of his own acts."

This is hardly fair of Dr. Nugent, for Mr. Wilson not only does not try to escape, but has stood, and still stands his ground, in opposition to the repeated solicitations of his friends, who say it is idle, however strong his proofs—however just his cause—to attempt to contend against a phalanx of officials. Judging only from the present case, I should have thought Dr. Nugent the very last person entitled to tax another with attempting to *evade* or *escape* from the consequences of his own acts.

He says "I made charges which were not substantiated." Suppose me to have made charges (which I have clearly shown I did not, though adhering and swearing to my statement) in many a case, (where there was little, even no doubt, either in the public mind, or the minds of jurors) has there been a verdict of "not proven" without the testimony of the witness being impeached—certainly without being *first impeached*—and *subsequently palliated* by a special finding.

Dr. Nugent is pleased to "acquit me of any unworthy motive, and is willing to give me credit for good intentions as regards the Limerick asylum." Very condescending, and considerate, and consistent. How a man, if he fabricated, propagated, and deliberately swore to a fact as having occurred, that could not have occurred, can be deemed "devoid of unworthy motive"—how he can be deemed as "entitled to credit for good intentions," is to me, I must confess, perfectly incomprehensible.

Dr. Nugent concludes by saying, "he thinks my time, my pen, and my money, could be much better employed, than in assailing a public officer, whose sole ambition is to fulfil his duty."

If so employed, could not be more disreputably employed. If employed in calling attention to facts which may have the effect of securing for the most helpless of our fellow-creatures the amount of sustenance the state has awarded them—could not be better employed. If employed in endeavouring to obtain "even-handed justice" from the Irish executive, especially where officials are concerned, I am afraid I must pronounce that they could not be more "unprofitably" employed.

Having now, My Lord, gone through Dr. Nugent's letter to the Under-Secretary, paragraph by paragraph, (except one that I will hereafter advert to) I shall endeavour to bring this too lengthy letter to a close.

Dr. Nugent states that I have "put forward letters through the press not composed with the taste one might expect from an educated gentleman." Though quite unconscious what the particular expressions were, to which Dr. Nugent alludes as "exhibiting a want of taste," ('tis probable they were many), I do assure Dr. Nugent that, considering the

course adopted by him at the first enquiry—and his opening address at the second enquiry—I was deemed far too forbearing, when, “travelling out of his record,” he thought proper to attribute to me “a morbid disposition to take offence,” and said “he would take care there should be no humbug” in not at once applying to him his “soubriquet,” as so particularly applicable to his entire course of action, throughout the entire of the proceedings. Nor shall I now, (notwithstanding the indisputable ground for its applicability, which he furnishes in his recent letter) be tempted to give it utterance.

But ere Dr. Nugent charged me with having “a morbid disposition to take offence,” and as “evincing bad taste,” it would have been well he had recollected a letter which appeared in the latter end of 1858, entitled, “Observations on the Report of the Commissioners of Enquiry into Lunatic Asylums,” and from which letter I had at the time seen some spicy extracts.

This ably penned (but in my opinion not very consistent letter) I have now before me in its entirety. Where the writer represents the Commissioners as ignorant of the provisions of several Acts of Parliament to which he refers—as misconceiving—illogical—overlooking legal difficulties—speaking in negative terms—of adverting to facts which never existed—of finding fault where the writer is satisfied the Chief Secretary will approve—of ignorance of the Privy Council’s regulations—of ambiguity—of not applying in proper quarters for information, and thus falling into serious error—interpreting an Act of Parliament erroneously—inaccurate as to the source whence rules emanated;—I confess myself totally at a loss to conceive how men, whose mode of proceeding is thus described by the writer, should by the same writer be designated as “persons of acknowledged abilities.”

And where the writer further represents the Commissioners, whose office he states “might be regarded as judicial”—as overlooking merit—as depicting in no weak colouring, faults and imperfections—as losing few opportunities of stating facts that could tell against asylums, even by implication—as withholding explanations—which if given, would have modified in some cases—perhaps imparted a totally different aspect to their representations;—and if he undertakes to shew “that in the Commissioners’ Report a fair equipoise has not been regarded,—in other words, that it has the appearance of being one-sided;”—how the person who thus wrote of the Commissioners, could at the same time declare it “to be far from his intention to attribute any but the fairest motives to those gentlemen” of “acknowledged ability,”—who thus conducted their investigations—as well as framed their report—is to me, I must confess, still further cause for surprise.

And that the writer should, in the face of such imputations, conclude his letter by stating—“he had carefully abstained from introducing any thing that could possibly give umbrage to the gentlemen whose signatures were affixed to the Report, and for whom personally he entertained every sentiment of respect;” does to me (ignorant of the forms of official etiquette) appear as inexplicable, and incomprehensible—as a person “acquitting a man of unworthy motives,” and giving him “credit for good intentions,” whom he, and in reference to the same subject,—virtually pronounces—as deliberately swearing—to a deliberate falsehood.

Even making all due allowance for the very sore feeling evinced by the writer,—I am totally at a loss to conceive how after (if report speaks truly) experiencing the forbearance of the Commissioners to an extraordinary extent, he should not only, not shew his gratitude,—but exhibit such “a morbid disposition to take offence” as appears throughout the letter—

Not because of any enquiry of which he should have had notice, and at which he should have been present, being held without notice, behind his back; but because the Commissioners did not, as he conceived, sufficiently appreciate, and bear testimony to—the originality, and merits of his views and suggestions—and the ability and zeal with which he discharged his duties—and because among various other sins of omission and commission—of a major, and a minor nature—with which they are charged—the Commissioners were guilty, without sufficient data, and proof—of reporting on “*Systematically-kept-locked-water-closets.*”

And if the Report which the writer so minutely and so closely criticized, was the Report of a Commission appointed by a *Whig* Government—and if the letter came forth shortly after the Whigs had been *ejected* from office—and if the letter was addressed to a *Tory* Chief Secretary, who had just *come into* office—and if the writer of the letter was indebted to a *Whig* Government for the appointment which he held at the time he wrote, and still continues to hold—I much doubt if any of my “exhibitions of bad taste” alluded to by Dr. Nugent, will, under the circumstances, be considered—as exceeding that evinced by the writer of the letter in question.

And if the writer, he holding office under the Crown, so managed—that his letter, impeaching a Report of a Commission of Enquiry, under Royal Warrant, should be printed by the Queen’s Printer, “for Her Majesty’s Stationery Office,”—and make its appearance from the office of the Printer, almost at the same time with the Report itself—it cannot be denied that any individual, combining an admitted talent for writing, and exhibiting such indisputable proof of ability in official dodging—must in every respect prove a formidable opponent to a mere country squire.

The writer commences his letter by stating—“The Commissioners appointed by Royal Warrant, to enquire into the state of Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, having published their Report, and as portions of it, if left unnoticed, might lead to erroneous conclusions in the minds of those whose knowledge of the subject would be confined to the information contained in that Report, he respectfully begs leave to submit certain observations thereon which may tend to a more correct estimation of the general working of these institutions.” And for the same reasons assigned by the writer, in putting forth his observations on the Commissioners’ Report; do I now feel myself not only justified, but compelled in my own defence, to put forward this my statement, in consequence of the tenor of the Inspector’s Reports; and the course pursued towards me by officials—and by others—“lest portions of the Reports of the Inspector, and the proceedings and findings of the 17th of December, if left unnoticed, might lead to erroneous conclusions.”

Lest I may be again charged by the Inspector, with writing and expressing myself vaguely, I beg to say that the letter which I have alluded to, purports to have been written by—“*John Nugent, M.D.,*

Inspector of Lunatic Asylums, and printed by Alex. Thom and Sons, for Her Majesty's Stationery Office."

At page 28 of the Report of the proceedings of the 17th December, your Excellency will find Dr. Nugent asks me:—

"How many entries were there then, that are not there now?"

"Mr. Wilson.—I have a distinct recollection of two, but I believe there were three. I have also a distinct recollection of another, which had been written over the Christian name of the clerk. I have a reason—

"Dr. Nugent.—We are not to have reasons, we are to have facts.

"Mayor.—Oh, Mr. Wilson has a right to give his reasons for recollecting those matters.

"Mr. Wilson.—When I arrived at home, I mentioned having seen those entries. And that fact leaves no doubt on my mind whatsoever about them."(a)

This observation of Dr. Nugent (independent of his manner) on what I intended to be a straightforward answer to his question, may convey some idea to your Excellency of his mode of conducting the enquiry—and affords another specimen of the "marked respect," with which, as he stated, he treated Mr. Wilson. And the observation of the Mayor would tend to show I needed the protection which I have stated he afforded me. While the manner in which I am endeavouring to meet Dr. Nugent's letter to the Under-Secretary, I think evinces an anxiety—not to meet assertion, by assertion—or excuses—or even by reasons—but by dates,—and documents,—and facts,—and for which facts, Dr. Nugent evinced so strong a desire. In reply to Dr. Nugent's statement that "I was most uncourteous during the enquiry to himself, and not very complimentary to the Governors themselves:" I have to say, I think it ill becomes Dr. Nugent to complain of a want of courtesy towards him, from a person to whom he had alluded in such terms as he did to me in his opening address. It is quite true when he attempted to put obstacles in the way of my reading "the *rare* entries,"—and the taking my deposition on oath—that I insisted he should hear the entries read, and that my deposition should be taken—this was the head and front of my offending on that score—and occurred after his remarks on me.

I am not aware of being wanting in courtesy to any of the governors, unless my requesting one (who had wandered away altogether from the question I put the governors) to give a direct answer, can be considered a ground for complaint. I was myself included in my allusion to "governors' neglects" in not having before examined, and acted on the complaints in the Report Book.

In my early exertions to establish a system of outdoor employment for the males, and turn the land attached to the Asylum to the best account—I received the most cordial cooperation and support, from the late Lord Clare, Sir Richard Bourke, the Rev. M. Pinkerton, Mr. Singleton and Mr.

(a) In a few days afterwards, I mentioned the circumstance to two friends in England, and immediately after my return to Ireland, on my telling it to another, and that I intended going into Limerick next day to make a copy of the entries, he quaintly observed, "Take care will you find them. I'm sorry you did not do it at the time you saw them," &c. When I scouted his observation, half jest, half earnest, I was met by "Well, wait awhile." I did go on the next day to make the copy, and those entries I have alluded to were not to be found.

Howley—from the respected Manager, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. William Blacker—a household name in Ireland, as connected with the improvement of small farms. Some of their letters I still hold.

In my more recent attempts, to get back to the equipoise, which formerly existed, as to the number of inmates from Clare and Limerick*—and relieve myself from imputations, arising from those attempts,—I was ever met with the most marked courtesy, and frank and kindly feeling by the Limerick governors, who unhesitatingly pronounced on the truthfulness of my statements before the Board;—and the only substantive proposition I made, in reference to the admission of Clare patients, was unanimously agreed to—and there is little doubt, that had your Excellency's Under Secretary or Inspector of asylums, on whomever devolved the task, acted the straightforward part, and given that notice which, if not in courtesy, they in point of duty, I contend, were bound to have given—that the matter which led to my letter to your Excellency of the 8th of June would have been arranged.

Statements are so conflicting, as to the mode in which communications to Government are disposed of, that we who are not behind the scenes feel a difficulty in coming to a conclusion on the subject. Not one in twenty, it is said, are ever placed before the Head of the Government, and when we come to review the facts, connected with the present case, we are at a loss to conceive (tho' I early intimated I had little hope of redress) how if the matter had been fairly placed before your Excellency, the decision could have been come to—"that your Excellency did not deem it necessary to take any further steps in the matter."†

* NUMBER OF LUNATICS IN THE ASYLUM.

	1846.	1859.	Increase.
From Limerick City	34	62	28
„ Limerick County	102	162	60
„ Clare	106	112	6
„ Kerry	96	—	— !!!

Thus was the increased accommodation obtained by the separation of Kerry from Limerick appropriated.

† In the year (I think it was) 1825 the militia were called out for training. Colonel Hughes—afterwards Lord Dinorben—not wishing to have his Anglesea men exposed to the gaze of the public, while learning the goose-step, had them drilled in the Castle yard at Beaumaris. After some ten or twelve days, they were paraded on the green, and the greater portion of Beaumaris turned out to see their brethren, perform their evolutions. The present Sir Robert Bulkely Williams—then a very prepossessing, active, young officer—on changing flank (while his company were wheeling) said in *sotto voce* "Very well, indeed, men—very well, indeed;"—and, considering the short time they were in training (though four or five had missed the step) it was "Very well, indeed." An Irishman who was standing by, and had evidently been in the army, very quietly observed to a person beside him, "By my sowl, I'd like to sarve under him, he's so aisily plaised."

Whether the meat contractor fulfilled the terms of his contract I know not—I only deal with the entries. Whether correct—or incorrect—I know not—but if the entries be correct, I'll not say as to the *quality* of the meat (let that, in accordance with Dr. Nugent's view of the case, be a *matter of opinion* between Mr. Kelly, (*contractor*) and Mr. Bodkin, (*clerk*) but merely as to the *parts supplied*—as compared with the *parts agreed to be supplied by the terms of the contract*—and on which the clerk might be supposed as competent to pronounce—I say if even in the face of the entries which now appear (few as compared with those which, in accordance with the Inspector's order, *ought to appear*) the Resident Physician

Notwithstanding a previous declaration of despair of redress from the course pursued by your Excellency's officials, a hope was indulged, that a recollection of a former affair might be revived by the expression, "even handed Justice," and that it was which caused me to appeal for it, in the note which accompanied my letter to your Excellency of the 15th of March.

The term "even handed Justice" was borrowed from a case which occurred during your Excellency's Chief-Secretaryship in 1837. It was one of waylaying—under most aggravating circumstances—the victim "Daniel Molony" was left for dead—the assailants after much difficulty brought to trial—sentenced to 7 years transportation—barrister declaring the case should have been sent to assizes—that they might have been transported for life—sentence commuted under extraordinary circumstances—and without reference to the barrister or magistrates who tried the case. And notwithstanding an official assurance was given on the 4th of August, that no commutation would take place without due consideration—it turned out that commutation had absolutely taken place—on the 11th of May.*

The disclosures which my correspondence with the Government elicited upon that occasion were not such as to reflect credit on the mode of conducting the business of the office of which your Excellency was then the head. Your Excellency was incapable of being a party to the facts which the disclosures elicited—and which your Excellency was pleased to merely term "irregularities"—but which were in every quarter considered as something more. I asked—I urged—I prayed for enquiry—I was met by some complimentary expressions, by apologies, and regrets—in *many* letters from your Excellency to Lord Fitzgerald, in *not a few to myself*—enquiry refused—I tendered my resignation of the commission of the peace—giving my reasons.

An address from thirteen magistrates, and over three hundred tenant-farmers, of the district, got up during my absence on the Continent, resulted in my finding myself, shortly after my return—and without any application on my part (for I had refused to make any) again reinstated in the commission of the peace.

Those antecedents, I was induced to think, gave me some additional claim upon your Excellency—not for place—not for favor—but for that to which every man is entitled, "even handed justice." That I feel has been withheld from me, by the intimation—"that your Excellency does not deem it necessary to take any further steps in the matter." Whether

persists in deeming the contractor a satisfactory contractor—and the complaints against him as light—and if the Inspector continues of opinion, that the complaints should be considered *rare*—and if his Excellency, in the face of the entries, agrees in the opinion expressed by the Inspector, and Resident Physician—and is so satisfied with the reports of the Inspector, that "he does not deem it necessary to take any further steps in the matter"—I have little doubt the public will consider, that Inspector, Resident Physician, and Contractor should all be glad to serve under an Excellency, who is "*so easily pleased*."

* If it be said that Mr. Wilson should not have been the person to complain of a misstatement as to dating, inasmuch as he himself fell into one in reference to a threatening notice—be it also told, that in perseveringly courting enquiry—he did not fail to duly apprise all whom the notice might be supposed to concern—that he left no exertion untried to have the entire matter closely sifted, but in vain—and still dares it—and the production of documents in the hands of officials—which had been submitted to his counsel.

this intimation emanates from your Excellency—or your Excellency's Under-Secretary, I am left to conjecture.

Having abandoned all hope of the executive quashing the (I will ever contend) informal, inconsistent, and unprecedented proceedings, of which I have complained—your Excellency will perceive, that though addressed to your Excellency, this letter is really intended for a tribunal, that “even-handed justice” is seldom sought from in vain—“the public.” To it without further comment I commit this correspondence, only asking it to bear in mind—that my attention being called by two other Governors to entries which recorded evident breaches of a contract, materially affecting those who could not help themselves—I brought the matter under the notice of the Board; and that of the several entries so brought under my notice—and which I brought under the notice of the Board—but a solitary one now remains to be seen.

That for so doing, I have been subjected to a series of the most glaring misrepresentations, and even calumnies, as shewn by the facts which I have detailed.

And, above all, asking it to bear in mind that I was merely a private individual, taking an interest in—and anxious to faithfully discharge—a charitable trust.

I have the honor to be,

Your Excellency's obedient and humble servant,

D. J. WILSON.