

WX

U58r

1818

e.1

F. 1m 7562 3100 5

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

APRIL 1, 1878.—Ordered to be printed.

MR. EATON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT:

On the 24th day of January, 1878, the following resolution was adopted by the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be directed to examine into the affairs of the Freedmen's Hospital of the District of Columbia, and ascertain its condition and general management; and that they call upon the Secretary of the Interior and request from him such information as he may have relating to its general management, and economical administration, and that they make such further investigations into all its departments as in their judgment the public interests may require.

In accordance with said resolution, the Committee on Appropriations authorized a subcommittee to make the investigation contemplated by the resolution, consisting of Mr. Sargent, Mr. Allison, and Mr. Eaton.

The subcommittee proceeded with this labor, called upon the Secretary of the Interior for such information as he had on the subject, and took the testimony of witnesses covering three hundred and five pages and an appendix, which are herewith submitted, and having reported in writing their conclusions to the full committee, with the testimony, the same were adopted by the committee, which authorized the report to be presented to the Senate as the report of the Committee of Appropriations.

In response to the request made to the Secretary of the Interior for such information as he might have relating to the general management and economical administration of the hospital, the committee received two reports made by special committees appointed by the Secretary within the year, with voluminous testimony taken by the second of said committees, letters, schedules, affidavits, &c. The first investigation was made by a committee consisting of one employé of the Treasury and two of the Interior Department, who were instructed to investigate and report in relation to the financial operations of the institution. The report of this committee was filed in August, 1877, and commended the financial conduct of the institution under Dr. Palmer's administration, and approved his conduct of his trust. The committee said:

The books and papers of the hospital for several years were carefully examined, and appeared to be perfectly correct.

The committee ascertained that no money is handled at this institution. All purchases are made by the surgeon in charge, in open market, under full and free competition, at the lowest attainable rates. All stores are weighed on receipt, and properly cured for until consumed. The patients are well fed with wholesome, well-prepared food, the bread being of excellent quality.

The committee learned that the bread is not made on the premises, but flour is exchanged for bread, pound for pound. This practice should be stopped, in the opinion of the committee, and it recommends that an appropriation be asked of Congress to establish a bakery on the premises.

Invoices of all purchases are certified by the surgeon in charge, and paid by the disbursing clerk of the Department of the Interior. Clothing is issued on a requisition

of the surgeon in charge, a considerable portion of which is made up by patients, and a strict account of it kept in a "clothing-book."

The committee sees no particular cause for recommending any alteration in the manner of keeping the books and papers of the hospital, except as to property accountability. An account of stock should be taken, and a property account kept; and the committee recommends that a board of survey be appointed to inspect and condemn certain worthless articles, such as old worn-out blankets, &c., that they be at once disposed of, and that said board of survey should meet quarterly, say on the first Monday in January, April, July, and October in each year, for said purpose.

The committee learned that no clerk is allowed the hospital by authority of law; the person employed seems to do his duties in a clerical manner, receives \$50 per month for his services, and the surgeon in charge reports him a "laborer."

The committee was shown through the various wards, offices, store-house, &c., of the hospital by Dr. Palmer, and is unanimous in its approval of his conduct of his public trust.

A few days after the filing of the report of this committee, stating that it had personally inspected the various wards, offices, store-houses, &c., of the hospital, that "the patients are well fed with wholesome, well-prepared food, the bread being of excellent quality," and that "all purchases are made under full and free competition, at the lowest attainable rates," various charges were filed in the Interior Department, signed by a colored patient named Robert T. Johnson, alleging that bad food was given to patients, insufficient in quality and badly cooked; that the wards and water-closets were kept in a bad condition; that patients were neglected by the physicians and nurses; that supplies for the hospital were bought at high prices of retail dealers, &c. These charges will be found at length on pages 28, 29, and 30 of the testimony, and the reply of the surgeon-in-chief thereto on pages 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. On these charges the Secretary of the Interior appointed a board consisting of Dr. T. B. Hood of the Pension Office, Dr. George C. Ewing of the Secretary's office, and Dr. J. K. Walsh of the General Land Office, with instructions to examine into the condition and conduct of the Freedmen's Hospital, especially as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Johnson's charges. It was ordered that—

The board will proceed with the examination as soon as practicable, and will be allowed free access to any and all such books, papers, records, and rooms of the hospital as may be necessary to the purposes of the examination, and will also be allowed to take the evidence of officials, employes, or inmates of the hospital under oath, as prescribed by section 183 of the Revised Statutes.

Upon completion of their examination the board will make report in writing to the Secretary of the Interior, together with such suggestions or recommendations as may be deemed advisable.

The proceedings of the board will be conducted in secret sessions.

Acting under these instructions to investigate and report their conclusions, and whatever suggestions and recommendations they might deem advisable, the board entered upon their labors. The board was excellently constituted for its purpose, it being composed entirely of physicians, presumably learned in diseases and familiar with hospitals, and its conclusions, after weeks of personal inspection and patient examination of witnesses, have a value which could hardly be asserted of any report made by non-professional investigators. As this report sets out the charges in detail, and as it is the work of physicians who were afforded every facility by the Secretary of the Interior and surgeon-in-chief to obtain correct views of the management of the hospital, we here insert it:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1877.

SIR: The board constituted by your order of 24th September last "to examine into the condition and conduct of the Freedmen's Hospital, especially as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in the charges and specifications under date of Au-

gust 25, 1877, and signed by Robert T. Johnson," has the honor to submit the following report upon the charges and specifications signed by Robert T. Johnson, dated August 25, 1877:

SPECIFICATION FIRST.—"In that said Palmer provides the patients in said hospital revolting food measured out to each in quantity insufficient to satisfy hunger; the provender is execrably cooked and especially unfit for invalids, whose condition requires good, palatable, and nutritious food. Beeves' heads and legs, oftentimes putrid, chopped up and concocted into odious messes; pickled pork and beef, saturated in brine from time immemorial till it becomes semi-petrified and rusty; ancient mackerel, corroded with salt and nauseating in smell; sour bread and musty hominy; a solitary potato in its jacket, about the size of a hen's egg, allotted each patient at dinner, and insipid slops nominated coffee and tea, constitute, in substance, the regular diet of the institution, and the meals served in the mess-room do not actually cost more than seven cents per day for each patient.

"Superannated, slovenly, and unskillful persons are employed as cooks at four dollars per month for the services of each, and such culinary botches could not fail to spoil the best of viands if intrusted to them to prepare for the table; but with inferior provisions such as said Palmer supplies, they produce detestable messes that are not fit for any human being to eat."

The statements contained in this specification are not sustained by the facts; the quantity of food furnished has been amply sufficient, its quality good, and the cooking found to compare favorably with the average of hospitals.

Accompanying marked "6" is the "full diet" table of Seminary Hospital, Georgetown, D. C., given as a standard in the Hospital Steward's Manual, page 194, and marked "7" the "full diet" table of Freedmen's Hospital.

From January 1 to October 31, 1877, the average quantity of bread furnished each inmate has been one pound per day, of meat $2\frac{1}{4}$ pounds per month, of milk $1\frac{1}{2}$ gallons per month, together with a sufficient quantity of sugar, coffee, rice, hominy, butter, eggs, &c. The tables marked 8, 9, 10, and 11 give an idea of the quantity and variety of food furnished this hospital from July, 1874, to October 31, 1877.

In addition an "extra diet" is supplied, and consists of such lighter articles of food and delicacies as may be directed by the attending physicians; this was found of considerable variety, well adapted to the needs and cravings of sick people, and furnished to a very large proportion of the inmates.

The appropriation for subsistence for fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, is \$18,000; which gives an average of about 20 cents per day for each inmate.

SPECIFICATION SECOND.—"In that under said Palmer's management, the bath-room and water-closets attached to the male wards of said hospital are kept in an offensive condition; slops are emptied therein, and filthy utensils, used by the sick, are washed in the bath-tub in which the patients of the respective wards bathe, whereby they are exposed to imminent danger of contracting terrible diseases, and malaria is liable to be generated by the foul odors and decomposing matter therein that poison the atmosphere."

It was found by personal inspection that the bath-rooms, water-closets, &c., were in as good condition as could be expected, especially when the plan of the hospital buildings and character of the inmates are taken into consideration.

SPECIFICATION THIRD.—"In that, under said Palmer's management, the furniture, fixtures, and utensils in the wards are dilapidated, uncomfortable, mean, and unsuited for service; that the bedsteads, beds, pillows, sheets, blankets, spreads, chairs, tables, and other articles were transferred to said hospital by the government or sanitary commission when the Army hospitals were abandoned at the close of the late war, and have been in constant service and received severe usage for more than ten years; that the beds, bedding, and wainscots of the walls are infested with multitudinous and repulsive vermin of various kinds, and no proper effort is made to destroy them, and that the entire furniture and equipments of any one ward would not sell for the sum of one hundred dollars."

The board find that the bedsteads are of the style and character employed in Army hospitals, and have probably been in use for many years, but are still serviceable; that the beds and bedding have been changed from time to time as necessity has required; in that worn-out mattresses have been replaced by new ones manufactured in the hospital, and blankets purchased in such quantities from year to year to replace old ones as the appropriations would allow.

It was found upon inspection that a portion of the beds and bedding were old and worn, but it is believed that they are as good as the appropriation will allow, and such as would ordinarily be found in hospitals.

It is undoubtedly true that vermin of a certain class do exist in the beds and wainscoting of the walls, but it was not found that they existed in excessive numbers when the character of the inmates and their associations are considered. Proper measures we believe have been taken, under the instructions of the surgeons of the wards, to abate this nuisance as far as practicable, but it must be taken into consideration that

the buildings are of such construction as to afford lodgment to certain classes of vermin, such as bed-bugs and water-bugs, which could be destroyed wholly and successfully only by the destruction of the buildings themselves.

SPECIFICATION FOURTH.—“In that, under said Palmer's management, patients afflicted with contagious, infectious, and loathsome disorders are commingled promiscuously in the wards with the other patients, who are thus exposed to the dangers of contracting terrible maladies, whereas the patients so afflicted should be classified and congregated in private rooms, of which there is an abundance in said hospital, and thus be isolated from the other patients, who would be secured immunity from harm from that source.”

Patients suffering with the ordinarily so-called “contagious” diseases are not admitted to this hospital. The inmates may be divided into two classes—one comprising those not properly inmates of a hospital, but of an asylum, consisting of the old, decrepit, infirm, insane, idiotic, &c., and this class, it is understood, constitute a kind of legacy from the old Freedmen's Bureau, and have been maintained in the hospital, from its inception. The remaining class represent most of the non-contagious maladies, and since they are necessarily commingled in the wards, it cannot be otherwise than that they subject each other to annoyance and inconvenience. We were not able to find an abundance of private rooms, nor indeed any which could properly be assigned to private patients; such rooms in connection with each ward being intended for and used by attendants, and for the isolation of an occasional patient suffering with what is properly a loathsome disease; in short, the hospital is not constructed with any reference to the isolation of inmates.

We have failed to learn of any instance wherein one inmate has communicated disease to another by reason of contiguity, and do not consider it probable that such should happen.

SPECIFICATION FIFTH.—“In that, through said Palmer's remissness, consumptive and asthmatic patients are quartered in the wards among the other patients, who are thus compelled to breathe an atmosphere contaminated with the exhalations from diseased lungs, and are deprived of their sleep and disturbed in their rest at night by incessant and painful coughing, hawking, and expectorating, which in pulmonary complaints are infinitely worse in the night-time than during the day; whereas such obnoxious patients could readily be isolated from the others by assigning them to private rooms, which, with a reckless disregard for the health and comfort of the patients, are permitted to be occupied by employes of the institution, or by persons that are comparatively well.”

Consumptive and asthmatic patients were found commingled in the wards with other patients, but we do not believe that they could be assigned to private rooms or in any way segregated. The annoyances complained of have always been recognized as of the counterbalancing evils and inseparable from hospital life.

SPECIFICATION SIXTH.—“In that said Palmer has allowed private persons to keep three cows on the hospital premises at the government expense while he purchased from outside parties all the milk required for the use of the institution, yet the same number of cows belonging to the hospital could have been kept at the same cost and supplied the hospital with pure milk, whereby the government would have saved the large milk-bills that have been paid for that institution needlessly.”

The evidence shows that the cows mentioned were not fed at government expense, and we do not think it would be practicable to keep a sufficient number of cows to supply the institution with milk. The pasturage on the limited hospital grounds would not be sufficient for one cow.

SPECIFICATION SEVENTH.—“Said Palmer permits the Howard University and the Howard mansion to be constantly supplied with water at the government expense; the tank on each of these buildings is daily filled with water pumped by the government engineer at said hospital, who runs the government engine for that purpose with government fuel, at an estimated cost of five dollars per day, and the sum of eighteen hundred dollars of public money is thus misused annually, to which extent the appropriation to said hospital is diminished. Such conversion of public property to private use is a grave offense that demands punishment of the offender and restitution to the government.”

We find that at the time Dr. Palmer assumed charge of the Freedmen's Hospital a lease existed between the former surgeon-in-chief (Dr. R. Reyburn) and Howard University, in which, among other rights reserved to the said university, it was agreed that the engine located on the Freedmen's Hospital grounds, but belonging to the university, should be used “to pump water to the main buildings of Howard University one hour per day (Sundays excepted).” Copy of lease herewith marked “13.” In making a new lease, July 19, 1875 (copy herewith, marked “14”), which was approved by the honorable Secretary of the Interior in communication to Dr. Palmer, under date of July 22, 1875, the same agreement was made as to the use of the engine to pump water to the main buildings of Howard University.

The expense incurred by compliance with this provision of the lease does not exceed eighty (\$80) dollars per annum.

SPECIFICATION EIGHTH.—“Said Palmer has done grievous harm to the inmates of said hospital by abrogating the custom of employing a night-nurse for each ward, but compelling one man during the night to take charge of two wards containing at least sixty patients, and also attend to four fires in cold weather, which onerous duties cannot be properly discharged by a single individual. Hence patients, in severe cases, suffer intensely from neglect, and disturb the other patients by their cries for succor and relief, while the dying are abandoned to their fate, and suffered to expire in darkness and gloom, without care, solace, or sympathy, and are hustled out of the ward to the dead-house as soon as the vital spark is extinguished.”

The testimony fails to show that Dr. Palmer has abrogated any custom heretofore existing in the employment of night-nurses. The same number and the same individuals, with one or two exceptions, are employed now as under former administrations of the hospital. It is true that comparatively a small number of night-nurses are regularly employed, but it is expected, and properly so, that convalescents and others should, in emergency, furnish the extra help needed. In the wards which are occupied by the old and infirm only, no necessity exists for the employment of permanent night-nurses, and in the wards where needed a sufficient number of such nurses are, in our opinion, employed, and we failed to discover any instance of neglect of the dying by reason of insufficiency of such help.

SPECIFICATION NINTH.—“In that, under said Palmer's management, goods, wares, and merchandise required for said hospital have not been purchased as far as practicable on contracts awarded to lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement, as is the custom with the War and Navy Departments, and in every well-regulated government institution, but have, to a great extent, been procured from retail dealers in small quantities from time to time, as the immediate exigency demanded, whereby articles of inferior quality were obtained at high prices, the public money was squandered, and the hospital failed to receive the full benefit of the appropriations granted it by Congress.”

It is found, from examination of the bills for supplies, that the prices paid were generally fair and reasonable; for some few articles probably higher prices have been paid than the lowest wholesale market-prices; these articles were few in number, and taking the purchases altogether it is doubtful if the supplies could have been obtained more advantageously to the hospital.

The principal exception to this statement is found in the bills of Charles Fink & Co., in which the prices are somewhat higher than the prevailing rates. The attention of Mr. O. S. B. Wall (the principal member of the firm) was called to this by letter from Dr. Palmer, dated October 7, 1876 (copy herewith, marked 49).

The price paid for milk was the subject of consideration, and it was explained on the ground of the high standard of excellence, and moreover that the price had been reduced until it was now very considerably lower than under former administrations.

SPECIFICATION TENTH.—“The legitimate expenses of said hospital, as conducted under its present management, do not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars per annum, and all money beyond that sum drawn out of the Treasury has been misused, squandered, embezzled, or purloined. Through such perversion or abstraction of appropriated funds the government is alleged to have been plundered and the hospital defrauded to the amount of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars during the past five years, while the members of the medical staff, managers of the institution, have been raised from limited means to affluence, become the owners of valuable real estate, and fare sumptuously every day at the expense of the poor and the sick, the maimed and the dying, for whom Congress made liberal provision, if the public bounty had been honestly and judiciously administered for the sole benefit and behoof of the beneficiaries, and not for the individual profit and aggrandizement of the functionaries, to whom the execution of the trust was confided.”

The vouchers on file at the Interior Department and the evidence adduced furnish sufficient proof that the full amount appropriated for this hospital has been expended for the purposes for which it was intended, and none other; and not a particle of evidence has been presented to show that any portion of the several amounts annually appropriated has been “misused, squandered, embezzled, or purloined.” Nor has the board been able to procure any evidence that the “medical staff, managers of the institution,” have in any way benefited from their connection therewith except in the legitimate manner provided by law.

SPECIFICATION ELEVENTH.—“Under said Palmer's management, lunatics, idiots, blind persons, and able-bodied paupers are permanent inmates of said hospital, instead of being consigned to the institutions specially established for the reception of such unfortunates. Said hospital is a sanitary institution, created solely for the accommodation, care, and treatment of invalids, and the presence of these intruders among the patients is detrimental, repugnant, and dangerous to them. These individuals, moreover, occupy much room in the wards which ought to be appropriated to such persons as require medical and surgical treatment, many of whom are crowded out of said hospital by these objectionable inmates; the expense of supporting these creatures is a misuse of the money

appropriated for the maintenance of said hospital, and the patients, to that extent, are deprived of their rights and property. The lunatics and idiots are not treated as patients in charge of nurses, but are consigned to the custody of keepers, who frequently beat them and reduce them to subjection by fear and violence. They are clothed in rags, are filthy in their habits, and subsist on refuse and slops. These obnoxious persons are alleged to be domiciled in said hospital for the purpose of augmenting the total number of inmates in order that the maintenance of said hospital may plausibly be represented as costing more than is actually expended for its support."

This specification is based on a total misapprehension as to the spirit of this institution as well as of the facts; from the outset the blind, decrepit, old, idiotic, and insane indigent have been admitted to its privileges as well as those needing medical and surgical treatment; and although few of the former class have been admitted in latter years, yet the board do not find any provision of law excluding them. It is to the class of permanent inmates that clothing is issued regularly, and it has not been found that any of them have suffered from lack of proper supply; to the transient patients it is issued only where essentially necessary, but in no case have we found it withheld from them except for good and sufficient reasons.

It is very difficult, by reason of the mental condition of some of these inmates, to keep them properly clad, but, from a personal inspection and the evidence adduced, we are satisfied that in every respect they are as well cared for as possible under the circumstances; and as to being subjected to personal violence and abuse, it was found that but in few instances has force been used in correcting them, and the circumstances appear to have justified the course pursued.

SPECIFICATION TWELFTH.—"Since the commencement of the fiscal year, on the 1st day of July, 1877, three surgeons have been officially connected with said hospital, notwithstanding the appropriation act makes provision for the employment of two surgeons only for the current year. If these three surgeons have received compensation for their services at said hospital since July 1, 1877, the payment to one of them was unauthorized and illegal, the public money to that extent was misused for that purpose, and the money appropriated to said hospital was squandered to the amount of such disbursement. If, however, one of said surgeons continued his professional connection with said hospital and treated its patients without receiving any salary or compensation from the appropriation, it is palpable that he derives a profit out of the institution equivalent in value to his services, inasmuch as these surgeons are not so disinterested and philanthropic as to professionally treat poor, friendless, uninfluential invalids without pecuniary reward. Either circumstance evinces official malfeasance, unscrupulous greed, and flagrant betrayal of a sacred trust in the management of said hospital and its executive officers."

It was found that prior to June 30, 1877, there were employed in this hospital five medical officers, to wit:

Dr. G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief, salary \$2,400 per annum.

P. Glennan, executive officer, salary \$2,100 per annum.

C. B. Purvis, house physician, salary \$2,100 per annum.

A. T. Augusta, ward physician, salary \$1,200 per annum.

C. Goerner, dispensary clerk, salary \$1,080 per annum.

Since that period, with the exception of the month of July, when Dr. Goerner was still borne upon the rolls, there have been employed three medical officers, viz:

Dr. G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief, salary \$1,400 per annum.

Dr. P. Glennan, assistant surgeon and dispensary clerk, salary \$1,200 per annum.

Dr. C. B. Purvis, house physician, paid \$150 for July; and since, at the rate of \$1,400 per annum.

The salaries of Drs. Palmer and Glennan are fixed and provided for in the act making appropriation for the hospital for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878.

The manner of paying Dr. Purvis is explained in Dr. Palmer's written testimony (marked 5), by drawing upon a fund which has accumulated to the credit of the hospital in the shape of a hospital or surplus fund. This fund is in the hands of the disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and is drawn upon in the same manner as appropriated funds, and has always been held as a reserve fund to draw upon in emergencies, which is the case in the opinion of the surgeon-in-chief in this matter, he considering the services of three medical officers essential to the proper management of the institution; in which opinion we concur.

Upon the supplementary specifications signed by Robert T. Johnson, dated October 18, 1877.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION FIRST.—"Halls, lecture-rooms, dissecting-rooms, and private apartments, used or occupied exclusively by the Howard University Medical College, have been lighted and heated at the government expense out of the appropriation to Freedmen's Hospital, in contravention of law, since the first day of July, 1876, to the present time, through the procurement or with the knowledge of said Palmer."

The facts are that some months after Dr. Palmer assumed control of the hospital, to wit, July 19, 1875, he executed the lease heretofore referred to (marked 14), which was approved by the honorable Secretary of the Interior, July 22, 1875; under the terms of which certain rooms, &c., which had been in the occupancy of the medical department of Howard University were reserved to its use; and it was also agreed that these rooms, &c., should be heated and lighted at the expense of the government.

This lease expired June 30, 1876, and was not renewed nor, so far as we can ascertain or believe, were any of its provisions canceled. Dr. Palmer has continued to light and heat the said rooms in accordance with the terms of this expired lease, which, under the circumstances, it was his duty to do.

It might be explained that the lease referred to was simply in continuance of one which Dr. Palmer found in existence upon entering on the duties of surgeon-in-charge, and that he agreed to perform nothing new.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION SECOND.—“Furniture, fixtures, goods, and chattels, belonging to the government or purchased by it out of the appropriation to said hospital, have been placed in the halls, rooms, or apartments occupied by said medical college or the students thereof, or been used exclusively for the exercises, functions, benefit, or advantage of said college, in contravention of law, through the procurement or with the knowledge or sanction of said Palmer.”

It is not found that any “furniture, fixtures, goods, and chattels belonging to the government or purchased by it,” &c., are being used by the medical department of Howard University, with the exception of four stoves used in lieu of steam on the score of economy to carry out the agreement in lease as to heating these premises. (See Dr. Palmer's statement, marked 52.)

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION THIRD.—“Students of the Howard University Medical College have been furnished with meals or board at the government expense, defrayed by money diverted from the annual appropriations to the Freedmen's Hospital. An exclusive table, denominated the ‘students’ table,’ was regularly set in an apartment of said hospital, and was furnished and equipped in a proper and attractive manner, in marked contrast to the rude style and repulsive appearance of the patients’ and nurses’ tables. Choice meats, fish, vegetables, puddings, pies, fruits, and other delicacies were profusely supplied to the favored students, who were intruders at the hospital, and in no wise proper recipients of the government bounty. Students’ meals were prepared especially for them by the best cook employed at the hospital, and served at fashionable hours, while the patients and hospital employes, on the contrary, were restricted to scanty and unsuitable food, odiously cooked and served, consisting, to a large extent, of bad provisions, offal, and tainted, putrid, and spoiled provisions, wholly unmerchable, and the refuse or *débris* of the market. If said medical students paid for the meals or board which were provided for them at the government expense out of the hospital appropriations, it was incumbent on said Palmer to account for and dispose of the receipts in the manner provided by law, which this complainant is informed and believes was not done. If, on the other hand, said students were gratuitously furnished with such meals or board, then said Palmer has wasted, perverted, or misappropriated public property for private use, without compensation, in contravention of law, whereby the government was defrauded, the hospital injured, and the patients deprived of their rights, plundered of their money, and subjected to scanty or unfit sustenance, and the comfort and conveniences which invalids require.”

It was found that it had been the custom of this hospital, since its organization, to employ medical students of Howard University as resident students, they performing services as assistants in dispensary, writers of clinics, and various other duties in return for their board. This custom has been continued by Dr. Palmer, who, in common with his predecessor, as well as the other medical officers of the hospital, believed that services fully equivalent in value to the expense incurred were rendered by these students, without whose employment considerable amounts would have been compelled to be expended in the way of salaries.

We do not believe, from the testimony, that any discrimination was made in their favor as to the quality of food, &c., and we are of the opinion, from the testimony of the medical officers, who are the only persons capable of judging, that the services rendered fully compensated for any additional expense incurred for their board.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION FOURTH.—“Under the management of said Palmer, human remains, offal, and *débris* from the dissecting-rooms of said college have been stealthily removed at night from the college building, and inhumed on the premises of said hospital, in dangerous proximity to the wards, water-pipes, or cistern that furnish the water-supply of said hospital; and, furthermore, deceased patients have been surreptitiously transported from the hospital-wards or dead-house to said dissecting-rooms to be operated on, of which corpses some were returned at night to the dead-house in a cut or mangled condition, and the rest, after dissection, were preserved, in part, for skeletons or specimens, and the remains, offal, and *débris* were hidden in hospital grounds or some other place unfit for sepulture.”

We find, from the evidence, that in but one instance was material from the dissecting-

room buried on the hospital premises, and that this was done without the knowledge of the surgeon in charge; and it does not appear that any deleterious effect was produced on the inmates or any danger incurred of contaminating the water-supply.

No evidence has been submitted showing that dead bodies have been removed from the dead-house of the hospital to the dissecting-rooms of the medical college.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION FIFTH.—“Government property, appropriated to the use of the Freedmen's Hospital and committed to the official custody of said Palmer, has been disposed of, to a large amount, at public or private sale, and the proceeds thereof have not been accounted for or paid over to the government by said Palmer in the manner prescribed by law.”

The amount of government property disposed of by Dr. Palmer has been small, so far as can be ascertained; and we believe that the proceeds of such sales have been properly accounted for, as evidenced by statements herewith, marked 34 and 35.

The specifications having been treated in detail, the charge based thereon may now be considered:

CHARGE.—“I hereby charge Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, in the city of Washington, with dereliction of duty and official malfeasance; with culpable disregard for the safety, comfort, and welfare of the patients in that institution; with maladministration of its pecuniary affairs, whereby the public money appropriated for the maintenance and support of said hospital has been to a large extent perverted, embezzled, or abstracted; with wrongful, using or permitting others to use public property in his official custody for the benefit of private parties, and with being disqualified to hold the position and exercise the functions of surgeon-in-chief of said Freedmen's Hospital.”

FINDING.—From a careful and conscientious consideration of the testimony, the board does not find any of the above charges against Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, sustained.

SUMMARY.

The board, giving due weight and consideration to everything that has been adduced bearing on the management of the Freedmen's Hospital while under the charge of Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, believes:

That no foundation has existed or does now exist for the charge of maladministration in any respect.

That errors of judgment have been committed there is no doubt, but it is the opinion of the board that Dr. Palmer has conducted the affairs in an honest, conscientious, and efficient manner, with the same care for government property and funds as would be evinced by a thoroughly capable man in the case of his own private property.

In the absence of any definite law or instructions to guide him, he has safely adhered in a great degree to the traditions and precedents of the institution. Where he believed abuses existed, he corrected them, as instanced in the discharge of a chaplain at \$100 per month, and the cutting off of rations to the employes, a most expensive custom to the government, which had been handed down from the time of the quasi connection of the hospital with the Army.

It is a notable fact that, with no important exceptions (in point of fact only one or two nurses), the employes have all been connected with the hospital for many years.

No evidence worthy of consideration was adduced reflecting upon the subordinate medical officers, Drs. Glennan and Purvis, and the fact of their connection with the institution through all its changes for the past twelve or thirteen years is conclusive as to their efficiency and professional fitness for their positions.

The evidence signally fails in proving any misappropriation of public property, the few instances cited in the testimony being satisfactorily shown to have no foundation; the trivial articles mentioned belonging either to private individuals or Howard University.

The custom of the surgeon in charge of giving his horse one feed per day is explained by him as due to the large amount of work necessarily performed in the purchases and other matters connected with the outside duties of the institution.

In regard to the experiments on the palmétto leaves, the board, after mature consideration of all the testimony, believes the expense, if any, incurred thereby to have been too trivial for mention; and that if any had been incurred, the responsibility therefor would not rest with Dr. Palmer, who was careful to order that none should be.

The board has conscientiously endeavored to obtain every iota of evidence that could enlighten its members in this investigation, and in submitting the testimony have to explain its voluminous character by this fact. That much of it is irrelevant we are well aware, but from the ignorance and evident bias of many of the witnesses, it was deemed expedient, in view of probable revival without the important aid of the presence of the witnesses, that it should be as explicit as the scope of this investigation would permit.

The board, composed as it is of members of the medical profession, has to express the

opinion that the Freedmen's Hospital is not a first-class institution. In the first instance, the location and manner of construction of the buildings are bad; they have been in occupancy for something like eight years, and being frame, are liable to absorb and retain noxious germs that experience teaches us may only be dormant for lack of the exciting causes to the development of malignant disease.

Again, the appropriations are not now nor have they been of late years sufficiently large to enable the officers in charge to conduct a model hospital.

From the fact that the inmates as a body are from the lowest and most destitute of all our indigents, and their demands so importunate and numerous, it has begot and fixed the idea that the wards of this institution should be occupied by the very largest number compatible with comfort. This is a laudable feeling, and to the charitable, not biased by the demands of the present advanced state of the medical art, it would seem not to admit of question that the greater the number cared for in the present unquestionably comfortable hospital the greater the good done.

The board does not doubt but that one-half of the present number of inmates might be cared for in accordance with the highest standard of hospital excellence, but it would not nor could it, viewing all the peculiar surroundings, coolly recommend the deprivation to so many of the immense relief now afforded them.

To relieve the surgeon-in-chief of a portion of the great responsibility of managing an institution where the limits of his powers are so loosely defined, as well as to preclude the possibility of such grave charges being repeated with so little to sustain them, we would recommend the appointment by the honorable Secretary of the Interior of a board of visitors to the Freedmen's Hospital, with the usual powers of such bodies. The board can recommend no great expenditures upon a property not owned by the government, but would suggest the following improvements:

1st. The construction of covered ways from the wards to the dining-room, as also to the water-closets situated outside the wards.

2d. The addition to the furniture in the wards of small tables between the beds, as was the custom in Army hospitals.

3d. That when the weather shall permit, the interiors of the wards be renovated by an additional hard coating to the walls, and painting of wainscots, &c.

These improvements may be made at comparatively slight cost, and are proper objects for expenditure from the "hospital" or "surplus" fund of the institution, and, therefore, would necessitate no appropriation of public funds.

We feel it our duty in concluding this report to bear testimony to the alacrity and willingness with which Dr. G. S. Palmer and his subordinates at the Freedmen's Hospital aided this board in its labors. Every possible facility was extended for a thorough investigation, and the demands made are but slightly evidenced by the documentary testimony herewith.

The board were instructed to hold their sessions in secret, while the charges were published in the daily press. We are not aware that the report has been made public. To these circumstances may be owing the fact that the public mind has been partially prepossessed against the management of the hospital, and the Senate ordered the present investigation. Perhaps if the Senate had been in possession of the report of Dr. Hood and his associates, made after so much painstaking and conscientious labor, where these could have no motive except to faithfully discharge a duty for which they were fully competent, it would not have deemed it necessary to have the expense incurred of further inquiry. But the committee observed by the interview, stenographically reported, between the Secretary of the Interior and Solicitor Marble and the members of the board, found on page 328, that the board formed their conclusions in part from their judgment of the credibility of witnesses, and the committee therefore examined a large number of witnesses, in order to judge for themselves the degree of discretion exercised by the board in determining upon the credibility of witnesses.

This seemed the more necessary because the inmates of such institutions as the Freedmen's Hospital, and especially of that hospital, are drawn from the most needy and wretched classes of society, many of them imbecile and some idiotic, some degraded to beastliness by loathsome vices, and others bearing the impress of a life of extreme want. Some, among the inmates, are men and women of good character and considerable intelligence, consigned there by disease and poverty. Much

discrimination is necessary in judging testimony drawn from such sources. The greatest misfortune that could happen to these unfortunate beings would be to turn them from the hospital out into the streets to die, for they have no other shelter. Witnesses so situated, of such grade of intelligence and moral stamina, would be apt to avert such consequence by testifying so as to propitiate the power that could pronounce their fate, and to vary their testimony as different influences moved them. This was the case with the testimony given before the board, and taken subsequently as an aid to that investigation. The same witnesses testified differently at different times, and excused their contradictions by insisting that they had been unduly influenced at one time or another, by one side or the other. Some constraint seems to have been used on this class of witnesses to compel them to testify against the hospital, if the committee are correct in their inferences from the following correspondence laid before them by the Secretary of the Interior :

WASHINGTON, *October 18, 1877.*

SIR: A patient of the Freedmen's Hospital, named Peter Dorsey, was this day summoned by the investigating committee to appear before the commission and give his testimony, which was very important, in support of the charges made by me against the surgeon in charge of that institution. He promised this morning to attend as a witness, when called, but mysteriously disappeared or was spirited away, that he failed to appear when sent for by the committee. Intimidation, allurements, espionage, and treachery have been invoked to circumvent me and defeat the government in its efforts to investigate the management of a government institution. I therefore request that, in conformity to your promise to me, you shall order the expulsion of said Peter Dorsey from the Freedmen's Hospital as unworthy to receive the munificence of the government.

With great respect, I am your obedient servant,

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

HON. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of Interior.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 19, 1877.*

SIR: I hereby withdraw the letter I sent to you concerning Mr. Peter Dorsey of 18th instant. Mr. Dorsey this day appeared before the commission and gave his testimony in an intelligent, conscientious, and honorable manner, and he also satisfactorily explained his absence when summoned as a witness yesterday. Myself and my fellow patients desire that he should remain an inmate of the hospital until he is cured.

I am, with great respect, your obedient servant,

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

HON. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

Any one can trace through the testimony given before Dr. Hood's board, the subsequent affidavits and the testimony herewith submitted, a singular inconsistency of certain witnesses, to be partly excused from their fear of discharge from the hospital, but showing that no firm conclusions can be drawn from such testimony. The truth is only to be reached by taking witnesses where fears have not been operated on. For instance, William Brown testified against the hospital, next he made an affidavit taking back his testimony, next an affidavit inconsistent with that, and finally, before us, in vindication of the hospital. He subsequently asked to be recalled, and said :

WILLIAM BROWN (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. The committee are informed that you have a statement that you desire to make to us. You can make any statement that you see fit.—A. Well, the statement I want to make is concerning the commencement of the present affair. At the commencement there was a great deal of excitement around; they commenced talking to different ones, and before they had the investigation, before a man went and testified, the men talked with them, and they went before the committee when they met there.

Q. I do not understand you exactly.—A. I say that when they first commenced there a good many of them went before the committee and testified. Of course they had been talked to about going up and testifying.

Q. Talked to by whom?—A. Mr. Felton talked with them.

Q. Was that in your presence?—A. No; the men told me that they wanted me to go and testify; I told them that I did not care about coming here and testifying, because I did not know anything much about the law business, as I was there, and then I did not see anything wrong.

Q. Did you testify that there was anything wrong?—A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. They wanted you to testify against the management, and you said you did not know anything against it?—A. No; I did not know anything against the doctors.

Q. You did not testify against them?—A. I testified to what things I had seen, but then I did not see anything wrong.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What do you mean by saying "they"? Who are they?—A. Testify that things were wrong in management around the hospital.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Who spoke to you about it?—A. Mr. Felton was one. He told me he wanted me to testify before the committee. The investigation committee was up there.

Q. Did he leave it to you to state what things you had seen or did he tell you what you had seen?—A. Well, he had something written off about what went on there, and told me to speak these things because I had seen them.

Q. Had you seen them?—A. I have never seen half the things wrong that they said were contrary there.

Q. You had not seen the things that he stated in the paper?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you declined to do so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Mr. Felton satisfied with you declining?—A. Well, he must be satisfied, because I must go there before the committee. Everything that I thought was not right, I made objection to.

Q. Is there anything further you wanted to say?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you yourself say anything to any one about Mr. Felton swearing at you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom did you say that?—A. I spoke to Mr. Roby, the watchman, and then I spoke to some one else about it.

Q. Did Mr. Felton swear at you to get you to make an affidavit, or for any other reason? What did he swear at you about?—A. All there that did not talk with them and consult with them they said were spies, and several times they were cursing and I spoke to them about cursing in the ward there.

Q. You made an affidavit, did you not, that Dr. Purvis induced you to make a former affidavit?—A. Dr. Purvis spoke to me one day, and said he wanted me to give in evidence because I was there and saw all these things. I did not like to do so, because I was uneasy and did not know what it would come to. I told him I would see about it, but he did not persuade me to make an affidavit.

Q. Any affidavit you made you made of your own free will?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. Felton spoke to me about making an affidavit, and I told him no, I did not want to make an affidavit. He said yes. But the affidavit the doctor spoke to me about he did not persuade me to make.

Q. Do I understand you that Felton swore at you because you would not say that Dr. Purvis persuaded you to do it?—A. He was always swearing. Sometimes when I was making up files there in the building he would get to cursing anybody he would see going round about. He would curse them and abuse them, and it seemed as if he wanted everything very nice and correct around him. Any one who did not talk with them and talk the way they wanted him to talk, they would say he was a spy.

Q. Did you say to Mr. Roby that Felton made you say that Dr. Purvis induced you to make the affidavit which you did make, and swore at you to make you do it?—A. Mr. Felton told me that I must make an affidavit; I told him no, and he said yes, I must make an affidavit, because he was counsel for the case and I must make one.

Q. Did you do it?—A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Making you say "yes" where you had said "no"?—A. Yes, sir; but everything was upside down there. Everybody almost around the building was scared and did not know whether they would be discharged or not.

Q. Who were you afraid would discharge you?—A. I did not know whether they would go to headquarters and have us discharged. They were always writing letters.

Q. What do you mean by "headquarters"; the Interior Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say he was always writing there, and you were afraid he might get you discharged, and so you made the affidavit he wanted you to make?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I think it is stated in that affidavit that Dr. Purvis made you make an untruthful affidavit; is that true?—A. No, sir; it is not. Dr. Purvis did not make me. He only spoke to me about it twice, and I told him "no" one time, and he came to me and said he would like for me to make an affidavit, because I was there and had seen everything and knew about everything.

Q. Did Dr. Purvis or Dr. Palmer ever threaten you with discharge if you testified or did not testify?—A. No, sir; they never said a word to me about that. All the threatening was on the other side, from Mr. Felton and them—all the threatening which was made there.

Q. Whom do you mean by "them" besides Felton?—A. Him and Bob Johnson and Mr. Potter were pretty much going through the building. All three of them worked together.

Q. And they are the ones you mean by "them"?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of those men threatening other persons there?—A. I do not know. I heard the other men say so.

Q. You did not see it yourself?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Why did you not tell us this the other day when you testified at the hospital before this committee?—A. Well, I answered all the questions which you asked me the other day at the hospital.

Q. How came you to come now to do it? We are very glad to have you come and tell the whole truth; but why do you come?—A. Well, I came myself, and the reason I came was this: The other day, when you asked me to make a statement, I was a little excited, and I knew there was something left out, and I thought I would come here and make a statement.

Q. Whom did you say so to?—A. I said so to Mr. Roby: he and I were talking.

Q. The doctors did not know about it?—A. No; the doctors did not say anything about it.

Q. The doctors did not ask you to come?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have come of your own free will?—A. Yes, sir.

Brown's testimony is not relied upon by the committee as establishing any fact not deducible from its aberrations, viz, that patients and employés at the hospital were liable to be influenced by fear of discharge or loss of place, and other testimony, undrilled and unawed, must be looked for for a true knowledge of its affairs and management. As a reply to the alleged constraint and drilling of witnesses to compel them to testify against the doctors, it was alleged that the witnesses connected with the hospital had been made to subscribe affidavits not read to or understood by them in their favor. On that point we took the testimony of John H. Cook, who took these latter affidavits, as follows:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. A practicing lawyer here.

Q. Your office is in the Le Droit building, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you draw up some affidavits for witnesses in the case of the investigation of the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I did.

Q. Do you remember for what witnesses, or any of them? Did you draw one for Lucius Harcomb?—A. Yes; Lucius Harcomb, William Brown, and there were fifty or sixty of them altogether. I cannot call the names now; I would know them at once if I should see them.

Q. What was your method of drawing those affidavits?—A. With reference to the men you have named, some four or five came to the room of the surgeons, one at a time, sat down, and stated to me the facts contained in the affidavits, and I wrote down what they said, putting it in good English.

Q. You wrote it in their presence?—A. Yes, sir; they sat right by me. There may have been a surgeon present in one or two cases; Dr. Purvis may have been in the room, but in the majority of the instances the witness, or the person making the affidavit, and myself were alone in the room.

Q. Did you read the affidavits to them in every case?—A. I did; and you will find in the affidavits, I think, words interlined which they directed me to interline, showing what they intended to say. In every instance the affidavit was read over to them before they signed and swore to it.

Q. In the cases of those four or five persons who complained that they did not know the affidavits, you remember that that course was pursued?—A. I recollect distinctly that it was, and those men were very careful about what they said. They said they did not want to say anything to contradict the statements that they had made in their previous examination or something to that effect, and therefore I said to them "You perhaps had better not make any affidavit at all." For reasons which I knew not, they were willing and anxious to make affidavits and I took their statements.

Q. You did not change the ideas that they gave you in any degree, but endeavored to render their language into good English?—A. That was all. The affidavits will show that I interlined words to make them careful and strong in their favor, and at their suggestion.

Q. Lucius Harcomb, in an affidavit signed by his mark, made before O. S. B. Wall

justice of the peace, and a copy of which is sent to us from the Interior Department, says that he was not acquainted with the contents of the affidavit, and it did not correctly represent his convictions?—A. I simply have to say to the committee, if you wish any remark from me on that subject, that that statement is simply untrue. Lucius Harcomb is a pretty sharp fellow. He came there to say some things and not others, and only what he said is contained in the affidavit that I drew up for him.

Q. William Brown says that you "proceeded to interrogate him and pretended to transcribe his answers. Having finished his questions, Cook directed him to sign a paper, which he did without reading, but he did not answer to it, as no oath was administered to him"?—A. I simply say to the committee that after putting down what William Brown said to me, and after reading it over to him, I then stood up and with his hand uplifted he made oath to every word contained in the affidavit. I read it to him again before he made oath, he standing and I standing.

Q. He quotes from that affidavit these words: "That complaints against the hospital did not begin until Mr. Felton came." He says that he did not use such language. Do you remember that subject?—A. He certainly did. He said in substance, as far as I remember it now at this distance of time, that everything had passed along smoothly until Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson came there, and then complaints began.

Q. He further says that he never said or thought that the patients who testified before the investigating committee were continually talked to by Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson, and that they would not have testified as they did if they had not been urged to do so. Do you remember that subject?—A. Yes, sir. That was talked about also, and all of those men that testified said that the patients had been regularly talked to by Mr. Felton—the persons who testified before the investigating committee; and as I remember it now they also said that much of the testimony they gave was given because they were afraid that they would be turned out of the hospital if they did not so testify. In substance, that conversation occurred at the same time.

Q. Were these suggestions made by them, or were they drawn out by suggestions made by you?—A. I did not know anything about the matter at all. They were suggestions made by them. The witnesses appeared to have fallen out with Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson, and they were making their complaints to me, and in that way that subject came out. I knew nothing whatever of the fact that Felton had had any contact with them until it came out from them. Indeed, I was not prepared to say anything in their behalf. I simply went there to take down what they said, and I will say frankly with sympathy for them, for I did not want to be a party to foisting on the hospital or keeping on the hospital any gentlemen who were either incompetent or were treating them improperly. The sympathies I had were in the other direction.

Perhaps this matter is too long dwelt on, but the purpose is to show clearly that outside, disinterested testimony of persons familiar with the hospital from their official duties, doctors, ministers of religion, and those having had servants or friends there, &c., could only certainly interpret what was left confused by the eager partisanship or cringing servility of some of the inmates and employés.

The instructions and powers of the board confined them to the examination of "officials, employés, or inmates of the hospital."

The Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, was established under the Freedmen's Bureau for the care of the freedmen and refugees, and was one of a number in various Southern States. When the bureau was broken up there were persons in the various hospitals whom it was impossible to discharge, viz, idiots, imbeciles, very aged persons, &c., and these were collected in one hospital in this District. The hospital was the recipient of the remains of the contraband camps, which the government found on its hands and had, necessarily, to provide for. In 1869 the following act was passed:

AN ACT relating to freedmen's hospitals.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the Bureau of Refugees and Freedmen is authorized and directed to continue the freedmen's hospitals at Richmond, Virginia; Vicksburg, Mississippi; and in the District of Columbia, including the asylum for aged and infirm freedmen and for orphan children: *Provided,* That the expense thereof shall be paid by the Commissioner out of moneys heretofore appropriated for the use of the bureau: *And provided further,* That said hospitals shall be discontinued as soon as may be practicable in the discretion of the President of the United States.

Approved April 7, 1869.

This law included the orphan children among the patients of the hospital, and they were, for a time, under the same management and support, but subsequently were gathered into the orphan asylum and drew rations from the hospital down to the present year, mostly in flour, under the manual issued to the officers of the Freedmen's Bureau by the War Department, dated January 21, 1867, as follows:

The Subsistence Department, as may be most convenient or least expensive to it, and according to the condition and amount of its supplies, shall determine whether soft bread, or flour, or other component parts of the ration as equivalents, shall be issued.

Congress has made regular yearly appropriations for the support of the hospital, not very large in amount, but imperatively needed for an indispensable charity. There is no other institution where the forlorn beings who occupy this hospital can get shelter, and to close it would be to turn out on the community a mass of disease and wretchedness of which little conception can be formed by any one who has not visited and examined the institution.

The first work performed by the committee was to thoroughly inspect the hospital in all its parts. The premises occupied by the hospital belong to the Howard University, and are held under a lease executed in 1874, which was renewed in 1875, which is a copy of previous leases, but which has not been renewed since that time, the Government holding over as a tenant at will under the conditions of the lease, which is as follows:

Memorandum of an agreement between the Howard University and Robert Reyburn, surgeon-in-charge of the Freedmen's Hospital, for the Interior Department of the United States, both of the county of Washington, in the District of Columbia, whereby the said Howard University has agreed to let and does hereby let to the said party of the second part the buildings and grounds known as the Freedmen's Hospital, in said county of Washington, by the year, commencing on the first day of July, A. D. 1874, and ending on the 30th day of June, A. D. 1875, at and for the sum of four thousand (4,000) dollars per annum, payable monthly on the last day of each month.

And the said Robert Reyburn, surgeon-in-charge, as aforesaid, has agreed to take and does hereby take and hold the said premises as tenant as aforesaid, upon the following conditions, to wit:

First. To pay to the treasurer of the said Howard University the said sum of four thousand (4,000) dollars, rent in monthly installments.

Second. To furnish light and heat for that portion of the main brick building necessary for and in use of the medical department of the said university.

Third. To consent, and does hereby consent to the reserved right and use of such portion of the said premises as has been used by said medical department, and to furnish facilities to the professors and others of the said medical department of the said university for clinical instruction in connection with the said medical department.

Fourth. To put the engine in said hospital in good repair, and direct the use of the same one hour per day (Sundays excepted) for pumping water to the main building of the said Howard University.

Fifth. To keep the buildings and improvements belonging to the said hospital premises in good repair.

Sixth. The Howard University reserves the rights mentioned in the above-named conditions to be performed by the said Robert Reyburn, surgeon, as aforesaid.

In testimony whereof the parties above mentioned have hereunto set their hands and seals this 29th day of September, A. D. 1874.

(Signed)

JOHN M. LANGSTON,
Vice-President and Acting President Howard University.

(Signed)

ROBERT REYBURN, M. D.,
*Surgeon in charge of Freedmen's Hospital,
for the Interior Department, United States.*

Witness:

(Signed) P. GLENNAN, M. D.

(Signed) J. B. JOHNSON.

(Duplicates.)

The rent of the hospital buildings and grounds has always been appropriated by Congress at \$1,000 until the current fiscal year, when but \$2,000 was appropriated, an insufficient sum, considering the extent and value of the property.

An inspection of the wards, bedding, kitchen, offices, &c., made by the committee, showed the same to be cleanly and in good order, while the food seemed to be good and well cooked. It was important for the committee to ascertain whether this cleanly condition of the hospital was induced by the pendency of the investigation or whether it was its usual condition. Various modes were adopted to discover the truth. All the persons in one ward were sworn whose grade of intelligence or condition of health seemed to justify their testifying; and they concurred in the statement that the then scrupulous cleanliness which the committee could see for themselves was usual, and had been during the various terms they had been in the hospital, and that they were satisfied with their food. These witnesses were examined in the absence of all persons except the committee and reporters. This testimony is here given in the order in which it was taken, so that at a glance it may be seen what all the available witnesses in a ward, unexpectedly called upon, and away as far as possible from overawing influences, had to say on these subjects.

WARD No. 1.

MICHAEL BOYLAN (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. How long have you been here ?—Answer. Two weeks last Wednesday.

Q. What is your treatment here at the hospital ?—A. Pretty good.

Q. Do you find the nurses and doctors attentive ?—A. Yes, sir ; very much.

Q. What do you have to eat ? Is your food wholesome and well cooked ?—A. Very well cooked, and considering that there are so many here it is very good ; good doctoring and good treatment indeed.

Q. Is there any further statement you wish to make ?—A. I know of nothing.

CHARLES RALLETTE (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is the number of this ward ?—Answer. No. 1, I think.

Q. How long have you been here ?—A. I believe I came on the 21st of January.

Q. How do you find your treatment here at the hospital ?—A. I find my treatment very well, considering. I have a first-rate physician. He has lifted me up wonderfully since I have been here. I came here in a dying state with the most terrific chronic diarrhoea, and he has built me up wonderfully.

Q. Do you find your food and attendance good ?—A. Very good indeed. I do not think there could be any fault found so far as I am concerned.

Q. How about the cleanliness of the beds, the floors, and so forth ? Are they kept in good order ?—A. Well, I think under present circumstances that they cannot be done much better. The place wants renovating, of course.

Q. Are the floors always as clean as these seem to be ?—A. Yes ; they work on the floors three or four times a week. They do their duty as far as I have observed. I do not think there is anything left undone.

Q. Do you find the quality of the food good ?—A. Well, sir, I have precisely what the doctor orders me for my disease, in good shape, it seems to me ; and I think from what I see that every man is allowed to take what is ordered him.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you leave your bed during the day ?—A. Very seldom yet.

Q. You do not go to the mess-table ?—A. No, sir ; I cannot go.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You receive your food by prescription ?—A. Yes, sir ; it is ordered by the doctor.

JOSEPH GOOD (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. How long have you been in the hospital ?—Answer. Ever since last May.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Do you recollect the day of the month ?—A. May 23.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What has been your treatment in the hospital ?—A. First rate ; no fault to find since I have been here.

Q. Have you had good food ?—A. Yes, sir ; good food and the place kept clean.

Q. Do you find that to be the case throughout this ward ?—A. Yes, sir ; throughout this ward.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Has it been so ever since you have been here, about the same uniformly ?—A. Yes, sir ; pretty much the same.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Has there been any change during the last three months ; that is to say, is it these last three months any different from what it was before ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Something has been said in the papers about putrid food being given to the patients. Do you find any such food ?—A. None has been given to me.

Q. Have you seen any given to any others ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is the food well cooked ?—A. Yes, sir ; well cooked.

Q. Is the bread sweet ?—A. The bread is good.

Q. How about the meat ?—A. The meat and bread are both very good since I have been here.

Q. Have you been kindly treated and well taken care of ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any statement you wish to make ?—A. None at all.

Q. None of the doctors are here, and nobody having any charge of the institution ; you are before a Senate committee, and are free to speak about anything to us.—A. I understand.

Q. How is it about the attention of the physicians to you ?—A. First rate, sir. Come here and you can see (exhibiting an amputated foot.)

Q. You came here with a wounded foot ?—A. Yes, sir ; frost-bitten.

Q. And it was amputated ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they have taken excellent care of you ?—A. Yes, sir.

JOHN BRESNAHAN (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. How long have you been at the hospital ?—Answer. Since the 11th of January, in this ward. I was two weeks before that, upstairs for six days ; got a relapse, and came in again, and requested to be brought into this ward.

Q. What is your treatment in the hospital ?—A. I find my treatment right good ; so far as doctoring, the best I ever saw, for I have been sick for the last eight years, and tried a good many doctors in the city, and never found a more experienced doctor, to my knowledge, than Drs. Glennan and Palmer. I made application to them for two weeks, coming in for medicine, and never found it so good in my behalf.

Q. Are the doctors attentive ? Are they here every day ?—A. Most every day. Dr. Glennan comes twice a day to visit the patients. I requested him, once, to give me a change of diet, and so he did. I find the diet always good enough.

Q. Does Dr. Palmer come also about the hospital ?—A. He does not come to this ward unless he goes through to inspect it.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Does he come through to inspect it ?—A. I see him coming through once a week, regularly.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is the food you get good ?—A. As good as I ever saw in any place for the like of a hospital. I get very good, healthy corn-bread ; very good, healthy wheat-flour bread ; hominy, rice, coffee, and tea, enough for me to eat.

Q. How is it about potatoes ?—A. We get potatoes, too.

Q. As many as you want ?—A. No ; not quite as many as I want. Sometimes I get one or two. Sometimes, perhaps, I do not care about potatoes for my disease at this time ; they do not suit it very well.

Q. There is no stinting in any kind of food—potatoes, or anything else—is there ?—A. I see enough to eat, for myself, more than I can eat, since I have come in.

Q. Do others about you in the ward seem to have enough ?—A. I cannot account for them. I see everybody, when he asks for more, getting it.

Q. How about the cleanliness of the room and beds ?—A. It is just as you see it now.

Q. It looks clean to me now.—A. It has to be cleaned every day after the night ; when the nurses come in the morning they clean it up ; and it is at this time of the day every day as you see it now.

Q. Has it always been so since you have been here?—A. Always since I have been here attended to and washed every other morning or through the day.

Q. It has been so ever since you have been here?—A. Ever since I have been here.

WILLIAM WILLIAMSON (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been here?—Answer. Two months.

Q. How do you find your treatment here?—A. I find it pretty well on the food, but very slim in clothing.

Q. The government did not give you a suit of clothes when you came?—A. No, sir.

Q. What disorder did you come with?—A. My toe was cut off.

Q. Frost-bitten?—A. No, sir; crushed.

Q. And you thought the government ought to have given you a suit of clothes?—A. Yes.

Q. Which it did not do?—A. It did not do it.

Q. You say your food is good?—A. Yes, sir; the food is good.

Q. Do the doctors take good care of your foot?—A. Yes, sir; they take good care of my foot.

Q. Is the hospital generally as clean as it is here?—A. Just this way all the time.

Q. And has been all the time you have been here?—A. Yes, sir.

HENRY BAER (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What position do you fill in this ward?—Answer. Attending to the sick, keeping them clean, feeding them, and attending to their medicine.

Q. Is this ward No. 1?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been in this hospital in that employ?—A. I have been connected with the Freedmen's Hospital some thirteen years.

Q. Have you been in this hospital ever since it was started?—A. No, sir; I was upstairs at the time Dr. Reyburn was here, and there were two nurses down here. Dr. Palmer took them upstairs and brought me down here.

Q. What kind of food has been given to the patients during the last two or three years?—A. Beef, hominy, rice, fish in season, sweet potatoes, and all such things.

Q. Are the articles good in quality?—A. Yes, sir; sometimes it is not cooked or something is not so good.

Q. Occasionally an article of meat may not be well cooked?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is the cooking generally?—A. The cooking generally is pretty good. Sometimes it is not cooked as well as others, but sometimes again it is cooked pretty well. We hardly see anything about it.

Q. Are the same cooks here now that were three months ago?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the same there were three years ago?—A. There are some new cooks, I think, within three years.

Q. Better cooks?—A. They have shifted them.

Q. Are the cooks as good as ever they were here?—A. Well, we had some cooks four or five years ago that I think were a little better than these here; but they are pretty good cooks.

Q. How much change has there been in the cooks during that time? Tell the names of the cooks that were here four or five years ago that are not here now.—A. Of the women there was Ann Henrietta Gant, Hester Arnstead, and then Fred Frazier and Louisa Frazier his wife, and that was about all.

Q. They were here four or five years ago?—A. Yes, or more than that, perhaps.

Q. Tell us those who were here three years ago who are not here now.—A. Hester Arnstead, I think, is one of them, as near as I can get at it, and Ann Henrietta Gant. That is about all.

Q. How many of those who are here now were here three years ago?—A. Butler, John, Sam, and Eliza Gray. Those I know were.

Q. Who is the head cook now?—A. Butler is, on the full diet; that is, for the dining-room.

Q. Do you always keep this ward as clean as it is now?—A. It is as clean as ever since I have been here, and I keep it as clean. It was not as clean when I first came and that was the reason of the shifting.

Q. How long is it since you came here?—A. I think it has been about four years.

Q. Then during the last four years you have kept this ward as clean as it is now?—A. Yes, sir; I kept it as clean from the first start after the change of nurses. That is what they made the change for. Ever since then it has been kept just as you see it now. Any time you would have found it just as it is now. I kept it so. If I attend to anything, I do it right or I do not want to do it all.

(See also the testimony from pages 114 to 138.)

So far as the committee could see, in respect to cleanliness, ward one was a fair example of all the wards. The excellent condition in which the wards and beds is kept is remarkable from the fact that the patients on their entrance are almost invariably covered with rags and vermin, many of them are persistently filthy in their personal habits, the uncontrollable effects of their diseases, or of carelessness, the result of habitual poverty, and only constant care and labor prevent the establishment being overrun with vermin and otherwise defiled. Some helpless patients require constant changing of beds as a condition of comparative decency. The complainant and several other witnesses insisted that the condition of the hospital as we found it was greatly improved over what it had been before the investigation by Dr. Hood and his colleagues.

This is contradicted by the report of the first committee, made in August, and hereinbefore cited, by the report of Dr. Hood's committee, and by a multitude of witnesses whose testimony will be found accompanying this report. On such points the committee sought to get the testimony of reliable persons outside, who had occasion to visit the hospital at various times, officially and otherwise, and whose evidence would be above any suspicion of ulterior purpose, rather than rely exclusively on that of inmates of the hospital, among whom there was more or less servility as well as partisanship and bitter vindictiveness. For this reason we examined the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who had visited the hospital in August, taking the officers by surprise. His testimony was as follows :

ALONZO BELL sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What position do you occupy ?—Answer. Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Q. Did you have occasion at any time to visit the Freedmen's Hospital ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you go there ?—A. As near as I can remember, some time in August. I cannot fix the date.

Q. Who accompanied you ?—A. The Secretary.

Q. Did you give notice to the physicians of your intention to visit it ?—A. No, sir.

Q. What did you find the condition of the hospital to be ?—A. We found it in very good condition; everything seemed to be in order.

Q. Did you notice about the cleanliness of the floors and the beds ?—A. I thought they were very clean.

Q. Did you examine the food of the patients ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you find about that ?—A. It seemed to be very good.

Q. Did you taste the bread ?—A. I tasted the bread. The bread was sweet; as good as I have in my own house.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. This was before the examination instituted by the department ?—A. Before.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is there any other statement with reference to the matter which you wish to make as to what you found there ?—A. No, sir. All I can say is that we went there without giving notice to any one at the hospital, and when we got there we made a pretty thorough inspection of everything that there was there, and found everything in apparently very good condition.

The committee called members of the Metropolitan police, whose duties took them to the hospital; among others, the following :

J. N. FIFIELD sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your occupation ?—Answer. Policeman on the Metropolitan police force.

Q. Have you visited the Freedmen's Hospital officially ?—A. I have. I have been in that neighborhood, on that beat, for the last seven years.

Q. What was the official occasion of your visiting there?—A. I have been called on to take patients there and leave them there. They have always been very accommodating, and they take patients in there gratuitously.

Q. Have you visited there by day and by night?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your observation of the manner in which the hospital is conducted?—A. As far as I know, and as far as I have seen, it has been very well. I have seen them giving the patients chicken-soup and broth, and the nourishment seemed to be very good.

Q. What has been your observation during the last three years as to the cleanliness of the institution?—A. Very good. I have been connected with other institutions of the kind myself before I went on the police force, and as far as I have seen, it was very cleanly.

Q. What seemed to be the treatment of the patients?—A. Very good.

Q. Would you afterward have occasion to see the persons you took there and talk to them?—A. Yes, sir; I used to have to call every day to see them. They were prisoners of mine at the time, who had been shot, for instance, and were very low. I have seen Dr. Purvis and Dr. Glennau attend to them daily, and they seemed to be very attentive to them.

Q. Would those persons make complaint to you of their treatment or food in any way?—A. I have never heard any complaint. I did not know what I was summoned here for at all.

Q. You have not had complaints from these persons during these years?—A. I have not. I have heard no complaints.

Q. Would they have opportunity to make complaint to you or be likely to make complaint to you if they were not well treated?—A. They would. I have been on that beat and have been going around the hospital for seven years until the last two months, when I was transferred to a beat farther out in the county. Up to that time for the last seven years it has been my duty to watch around that beat, and it is in a very bad neighborhood. There is near there a place called Cole's Row, full of very bad people; and this hospital is right in that place. It is one of the worst places in the city of Washington, I suppose, for bad characters.

Q. You say you were removed from that beat about two months ago?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. During a month or two before you were removed were you in the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you notice any difference, any improvement from what it was before?—A. I did not; I did not notice any change.

JAMES F. MCGRAW sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Metropolitan police officer.

Q. How long have you been connected with it?—A. Nearly five years; four years and six months.

Q. Have you had occasion, as an officer, to visit the Freedmen's Hospital during that time?—A. Yes, sir; frequently.

Q. What has called you there?—A. I have been there once or twice in cases of parties being shot; on another occasion in the case of a party who was knocked in the head with a brick, and in another case where a patient was very sick. I have had to summon parties there as witnesses, and to go over for the doctors, to bring them to the station and attend patients there once in a while.

Q. Would you be about in the hospital during those visits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was your observation of the conduct of the hospital?—A. It was always clean and respectable.

Q. Did you have conversation with any of the patients you took there as to their treatment?—A. Yes, sir. I used to go to see to them two or three times a week, perhaps.

Q. What was their testimony in reference to the condition of the hospital?—A. I saw them always pretty well satisfied—always well treated.

Q. Have you seen any improvement in that respect during the last few months?—A. No, sir; it is just the same as it always was, to my knowledge and belief. I do not see a particle of change.

H. K. REDWAY sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you sergeant of the Metropolitan police?—Answer. Yes, sir; one of the sergeants of the second precinct, where this hospital is located.

Q. How long have you been on the Metropolitan police?—A. Nearly ten years.

Q. Have you had occasion, officially, to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I have.

Q. How often do you think you have been there?—A. I have been there, perhaps, twice a week, then once a month, then once in two months, and so along for the last seven years. I have been in that precinct over seven years.

Q. What has been the occasion of your going there?—A. Generally to look after parties who had been injured and taken there for treatment.

Q. What was your observation of the manner in which the hospital has been conducted?—A. As far as I have been able to judge, it seemed to be well conducted. The patients seemed to be well cared for, and looked clean, and they were kept as cleanly as possible, as I should think patients could be, in the condition some of them were. I will state that I am particularly acquainted with Dr. Glennan, and was acquainted with him during the war. He was surgeon at the Stone Hospital, the Eye and Ear Infirmary, on Meridian Hill. I was very sick at Mount Pleasant Hospital. He used to come in to see me, and, being acquainted with him, I used to go over there, sometimes, to see him, as well as to look after parties taken there.

Q. Those visits, official and friendly, to Dr. Glennan, gave you an opportunity to see the manner in which the hospital was conducted?—A. Yes, sir; and being unfortunate enough to be in hospital once myself for awhile, I knew something of his treatment.

Q. Your knowledge of the matter, then, is that the Freedmen's Hospital was cleanly, and patients seemed to be contented and well taken care of?—A. So far as I could judge.

Q. Did you ever have any complaint from those you took there?—A. Never. We had men that were taken there, shot about the head and other places. I never heard any complaint. Their wounds seemed to be dressed, and well cared for generally.

Q. Were the men you took there all put in Dr. Glennan's ward, or in some of the other wards sometimes?—A. I have had occasion to go but very few times into Dr. Purvis's room, perhaps two or three times; generally into Dr. Glennan's.

Q. What was the condition of Dr. Purvis's ward?—A. It seemed to be clean and in good condition.

Q. Have you noticed any improvement in the hospital of late in that particular?—A. I do not know that I have. The doctors have been uniformly kind there. Whenever we have had occasion to send for one they have come at all times, night and day, whenever it was so that they could. They have always been ready to receive patients without any formality for the time being. It has been a great relief to us to be able to have some place to take parties who were badly injured and sick.

Q. Patients are received temporarily, you say. Do you apply after that to the Secretary of the Interior?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that for them to remain there, except temporarily, you would get permission from the Secretary of the Interior?—A. They would remain there until they recovered, or recovered sufficiently to be sent away.

WILLIAM H. WEST (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you connected with the Metropolitan police?—Answer. I am.

Q. How long have you been?—A. In the neighborhood of eight years.

Q. Have you had occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital officially?—A. Yes, sir; on several different occasions I have had to visit it.

Q. What business took you there?—A. I have had to go there to take patients there who were injured. In one instance I remember that a man was run over in the street—a very old man by the name of Travis Taylor, about seventy-odd years old. He was run over in the street, and I arrested the party that drove over him, took him to the police court, and took this old gentleman to the hospital and put him in the care of Dr. Purvis.

Q. Did Dr. Purvis receive him and take care of him?—A. He did, in the most kindly manner; so much so that the old gentleman, after his recovery, spoke in great credit to Dr. Purvis for the kind manner in which he was treated.

Q. What was your observation during your visits there as to the condition of the hospital?—A. I never found it in any other way than the most cleanly manner in each ward I visited. I visited several. I visited Dr. Glennan's and Dr. Purvis's wards—Dr. Purvis's more frequently than any other—and I have always found that in the most cleanly condition.

Q. Did you talk with these patients that you took there, and did they ever complain of their treatment?—A. No, sir. I have talked with five or six, and with some whom I did not take there. In one instance, Officer McGraw took a boy there who was hit in the head with a stone, and others who were shot, and they always spoke in the highest terms of the manner in which they were treated. I never heard a complaint from one before this complaint. Robert Johnson was the first man I ever heard say anything against the hospital.

Q. Are the policemen generally of the opinion in regard to this hospital of you four gentlemen who have been examined here, as far as you know?—A. Yes, sir. I have never heard any express themselves only in the same manner and with the greatest regard as to Dr. Purvis; and, in fact, all the doctors.

Q. You have heard them talk among themselves in that way?—A. Yes, sir.

Reference is also made to the testimony of Thomas Jones, page 263, a waiter at the Ebbitt House, who visited the hospital daily from June to September, 1877, and states that the hospital was always clean and de-

cent, the nurses and doctors a tentative, and the sick well taken care of. Also to that of Mr. and Mrs. Augustus Gusthoff, pages 244-5, who had a favorite servant at the hospital during last summer and visited her frequently. Mrs. G. said:

Q. What did you notice about the cleanliness of the ward?—A. I was there Monday and Friday, and several times Saturday. I think the place is as clean as anybody can wish it.

Q. Was it so last May and June?—A. It was just the same.

Q. You find no difference between now and then?—A. I cannot see that there is any.

Q. Did you ever see the food that was given to this girl?—A. I was there several times at supper, never at dinner.

Q. Was the food good?—A. Yes; I thought it was good enough for any person that was sick. Another lady was with me, and she said, "My, Mrs. Gusthoff, how well off are the people here; they cannot wish a better home."

Q. Did you ever notice anything about the cleanliness of the bedding?—A. Yes, sir; my girl is so clean, nobody can be more clean than our Mary—the nurse I am speaking of—and she told me all the time that she got all the clean bed-clothing she wished, a good mattress, and everything just clean. She could not stand it there if it was not clean.

Q. You saw for yourself whether it was clean or not?—A. I did.

Q. Were the neighboring beds of the same character?—A. All over they were the same.

The testimony of Rev. Felix Barrotti is given here at length from his opportunities of observation, and his high character as a priest and philanthropist:

Rev. FELIX BARROTTI sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am a Roman Catholic priest attending the colored people of the city of Washington, and the chaplain to the Home of the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the Children's Home in the northern part of the city.

Q. Where is your residence?—A. Eleven hundred and nineteen Fifteenth street.

Q. Have you visited the Freedmen's Hospital very often?—A. I have been attending the Freedmen's Hospital as a Catholic clergyman since 1857, the first of September.

Q. How often have you visited the hospital?—A. As a priest, I have attended sometimes two or three times a week, and then again it would be a month before I was called. It all depended on circumstances. I only had charge of the Catholic portion, and of course whenever there was any one needing my service the doctors were always kind enough to send for me. So whenever they needed my services I was there, sometimes two or three times a week, and I generally went there every fifteen days.

Q. What can you say with reference to the general cleanliness of the hospital during the time you have known it?—A. Do you extend this time to the whole ten years, or do you divide it?

Q. Begin and tell it as you have seen it from time to time.—A. As far as the general cleanliness is concerned, I always saw it clean and regularly clean. Inasmuch as I knew the very days that the hospital was to be cleaned and scrubbed and all that, I would not go on those particular days. The only complaint about cleanliness, as I suppose I am to tell the whole truth—

Q. Certainly.—A. It was only that about nine years ago, or something like that, there was a little smoking in the rooms, which, especially in the winter, I thought disagreeable to the patients; but of late I have not perceived it. There was a smoking in the rooms, and of course, especially in the winter, the windows not being open, I thought it was disagreeable.

Q. Do you mean the smoking of the stoves?—A. No: the smoking of pipes by the patients.

Q. How long ago was that broken up?—A. I have not perceived it for two or three years past, that I know of.

Q. Were you there last summer during June, July, August, and September?—A. I could scarcely say what times I was there, because I have no memorandum of it, but I have been there generally, either I or my assistant, regularly. There has not been a month that we did not go.

Q. Did you find the condition of the hospital during those months as you have now represented it?—A. I have always found it clean as far as I have seen it.

Q. You have been there during the last month or two?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find any difference in the condition of the hospital?—A. I find no difference, only that I find a different order at the door, that I was not admitted in on account of not being known by the person that was at the door. I was told that he had orders to let no one in unless he knew who he was. That was the only difference.

Q. You found some impediment in getting in, but you got in?—A. I got in.

Q. Otherwise you found it all the same?—A. All the same. I have been through it all.

Q. Do you encourage patients who are of your faith to talk freely with you about the hospital, and allow them to do so if they wish to make complaints?—A. Always. I have advised a good many to go there. I have advised others not. I have sometimes advised persons to go rather to that hospital than to others, for the reason that I always saw everything was proper there as far as I could see, and at the same time I had free access there. I could always go to attend to them, and I had no reason to believe that they would not be well received and have all the attention from the doctors they needed. I advised many to go to that hospital rather than to others on that account.

Q. Have those whom you have visited professionally complained to you of their treatment there?—A. I never heard one single complaint of that. The only complaint was that they did not get tobacco enough. That is the only complaint I have ever heard, that they could not smoke enough. These are those who are not sick, the old people who came from the old Freedmen's Bureau.

Q. What class of patients are they generally; are they poor, indigent persons?—A. As far as I have sent persons there, I have known them all to be really poor persons that had either to go to the poor-house or the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. Have you ever noticed anything yourself about the food at the hospital?—A. I was there a great many times, especially in the morning, the time we go as Catholics to give communion to our people, and I have seen when they were taking their breakfast; of course they had to keep their breakfast from the people until I arrived there. I am not much of an expert in food, but I never knew of anything that was not proper or was not good, wholesome food. I never saw anything else. Then I have been there a good many times, especially in the evenings, in summer; generally I go in the afternoon in the summer time, and I never have seen anything that was not wholesome; but I was not there very often at those times.

Q. You were there during the summer time to which I have alluded. Did you notice that the food was the same as at other times?—A. I never noticed that the food was different. I cannot say about those months particularly, but I know that there was scarcely a month that I was not there, either myself or my assistant, and I never observed anything.

Q. As far as you have observed, it has been uniformly good from the present back?—A. Yes, at the times I was there.

See also the testimony of Mrs. Eliza Heacock, matron of the Home of Colored Women and Children, page 176; of A. T. Cavis, of the Government Printing Office, page 248; of Dr. D. S. Lamb, of the Medical Museum, *ibid.*; of Dr. R. S. Walsh, page 184; of George Dolly, *ibid.*; of William Syphax, page 182; of Dr. Spackman, page 178, &c. Dr. Hood testified before us as follows:

Q. Did you find that the condition of the hospital improved as you proceeded with your investigation, or as a result of it?—A. It did not so occur to any of the committee, I believe; it certainly did not to myself.

Upon such testimony the committee conclude that the clean condition of the hospital and the excellence of the food, which were apparent to them and could not well be denied, were not new, the result of the recent investigation by the board headed by Dr. Hood, but were part of a careful system that had been enforced by the surgeon in charge ever since he had had charge of the hospital. It is true that during the absence of Dr. Palmer for several weeks on leave last summer one of the water-closets was torn to pieces by the engineer and left in a dismantled condition, to the inconvenience and annoyance of some of the patients. But Dr. Palmer ordered this to be put in order on his return as soon as his attention was called to it, and its condition was due to the negligence of the engineer, who is also the plumber, who considered himself injured by a reduction of his wages, and neglected the plumbing in consequence. He was reported by the surgeon-in-chief for discharge for neglect of duty, but no action has yet been taken thereon.

The committee personally inspected the books of the institution, examined the mode of keeping accounts, of making purchases, receiving and accounting for goods, rendering vouchers, &c., and believe the business of the government at this hospital is conducted with entire

honesty and economy. None of the money appropriated by Congress passes through the hands of the officers of the institution, except the extremely slender pay of the physicians. Dr. Palmer's salary is \$1,400 per year. He graduated from the Maine Medical College in 1838, practiced in the city of Gardiner, Me., till the war broke out, then went into the Army, and was first a regimental surgeon and then a surgeon of volunteers, and was assigned to duty in various parts of the Army. He had charge of Lincoln Hospital, in Washington, one of the largest hospitals at the time in the city. He served on the battle-field at Gettysburg, and then took charge of the hospitals in the Cumberland Valley under Dr. King. From there he went to Saint Louis and was superintendent of hospitals in the vicinity of Saint Louis under Dr. Mills. He then went to Annapolis and had charge of St. John's College Hospital till the war terminated, and at the same time was on the board of examiners for officers performing the duties of medical officer.

Dr. Purvis also receives \$1,400 per annum and Dr. Glennan \$1,200. A perusal of the testimony on pages 275, 278, 289, 290, will show that these physicians are skillful men. The testimony is abundant that Dr. Palmer maintains a sharp competition among dealers, and purchases at the lowest rates the best goods in the market, and of wholesale dealers. See the testimony of W. H. Hoover, of the Center Market, page 146; of W. Wolf, food-inspector under the Board of Health, page 148; of R. Hartwell, page 149, and S. Auth, page 150, both butchers; of W. Clary, of 923 Louisiana avenue, produce dealer, page 151; of T. J. Mayer, of the firm of W. M. Galt & Co., flour and feed dealers, page 156; of J. A. Hamilton, of the firm of Barbour & Hamilton, grocers, page 157; of Calvin Witmer, general grocer, 1918 Pennsylvania avenue, page 159; of William Dix, butter-dealer Center Market, page 160; and of W. De Mott, general merchandise, 921 Pennsylvania avenue, page 161; J. T. Rabbitt, produce-dealer, Center Market, page 246. All these gentlemen concurred in stating that Dr. Palmer is a close buyer, exacting the lowest wholesale prices and the best articles, with full weight and measure. The testimony of Mr. Hamilton is a fair illustration of that of all these persons, who are connected with the most reputable firms in the city:

JOHN A. HAMILTON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Of what firm are you a member?—Answer. Barbour & Hamilton.

Q. Where is your store?—A. On Louisiana avenue between Sixth and Seventh streets.

Q. What goods do you deal in?—A. All kinds of groceries.

Q. Do you furnish goods to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. We do.

Q. How do you get the trade?—A. Through Dr. Palmer.

Q. Why does Dr. Palmer give it to your firm?—A. That is more than I can say, unless it is that he can buy cheaper from us than from any one else.

Q. Does he inquire your prices before doing it?—A. He does.

Q. What is his course of dealing in that respect, as far as you know?—A. He comes around and inquires the prices, and, I suppose, goes to other places and inquires.

Q. Do you sell as low to him for the hospital as you do to anybody?—A. We do. We sell at wholesale prices.

Q. Do you ever make him any presents?—A. Never.

Q. Or furnish him goods to his own house cheaper because he buys of you?—A. I do not think I ever furnished five dollars of goods to him for his own house.

Q. You do not deal with him for his own house?—A. He has bought a ham or two, I think.

Q. And paid for them?—A. Paid for them.

Q. The market-price?—A. The market-price.

Q. Do you furnish the hominy for the hospital?—A. We have furnished part of it.

Q. During the past year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What quality of hominy do you furnish?—A. Good; with the exception of one barrel

which was returned a few days ago. That was good, but the grain was too large he said. Nothing was amiss with the hominy except that it was too large in the grain.

Q. Have you ever, either by accident or design, furnished any musty hominy for the establishment?—A. No, sir.

Q. You always furnish a good article?—A. A good article, always.

Q. What other articles have you furnished?—A. Sugar, coffee, tea, canned goods, rice, bacon, occasionally.

Q. Is the bacon good?—A. No. 1.

Q. Just as good as you sell to anybody?—A. The same quality we sell to our best customers.

Q. What is the article of coffee?—A. Rio.

Q. Is that a good article of coffee?—A. Choice Rio.

Q. What article of tea do you furnish?—A. Green and black.

Q. The same kind of tea you sell to your good customers?—A. The same as to our regular trade.

Q. Do you sell to the hospital as low as you do to your most favored customers?—A. As low as we do to any of our wholesale trade.

Q. And furnish as good articles?—A. As good articles.

Especial attention is directed to the testimony of Mr. Mayer, of the firm of Galt & Co., who have supplied flour to the hospital, because some question has been made as to the varying amounts of flour furnished in different months, and the inference drawn that it was inconsistent with fair dealing. He testified:

Q. Do you furnish flour to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you furnished flour to it?—A. Since 1874.

Q. What kind of flour do you furnish?—A. We furnish to them high-grade family flours.

Q. To whom do you deliver the flour?—A. Mostly to the bakery of Henry Kaiser.

Q. Where is the rest delivered to?—A. Now and then they get a few barrels at the hospital for pastry purposes, I suppose.

Q. Do you furnish about the same amount of flour each month, or are there variations?—A. Sometimes it varies a little, according to the number of patients, I suppose, and then, again, sometimes they are out about the 27th or 28th of the month, and then they order, perhaps on the 27th or 28th, twelve barrels more, which is the usual complement, and of course that makes it for that month a larger delivery, and next month it is generally that much smaller.

Q. Suppose you take three months together. Will one period of three months average with another period of three months about?—A. I presume it would, unless they should have an unusually large number of patients at one time.

Q. Do you know anything about Dr. Palmer making a purchase of an extra amount of flour under the anticipation of its rising in price?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that, and what was it?—A. It was last spring I think, when flour was low, and the tendency was that flour would advance, and it did advance. I told Dr. Palmer that flour was about as low as it was going to be, and that I thought it would advance. We thought it would be an advantage to the hospital to engage a month's supply in advance. It was the first of the month. I told him that it undoubtedly would advance. He said, "Well, we do not want that flour delivered all at once; we want it delivered the same as usual." I told him it would not make a particle of difference about the time of delivery; he could engage what they wanted during the month; he could count up what they had had during the last month and give me the order for the same number of barrels, and I would deliver it to suit him at the rates which then existed. I suppose the hospital was benefited about seventy-five cents or a dollar a barrel by his making the purchase.

Q. It made the apparent purchase for that month pretty large?—A. I think it was pretty large, because he bought, perhaps, a few barrels more than he actually needed for that month.

On examining the accounts of flour furnished, there seemed to be some other element to be considered besides the occasional purchase of flour before the commencement of the month in which the bulk of the amount purchased would be used, because a less number of patients sometimes consumed apparently more than a greater number at another time, though the amount used in one year seemed to correspond with the amount used in another and bear the same proportion to the general number of patients. To solve this, the committee called Dr. Reyburn, Dr. Palmer's predecessor at the hospital, and directed his attention to

the same state of facts under his administration. His explanation was full and satisfactory. He said :

Dr. ROBERT REYBURN sworn.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. I have here a monthly statement of the amount of flour used in the Freedmen's Hospital when you were in charge of it. Examine the list, if you please. [Handing list to the witness.] Explain how a larger number of barrels were used some months in proportion to the number of patients than others ; for instance, why, in some months, there seems to be a slightly less number of patients and a slightly greater amount of flour used, and another month more patients and the reverse, and so on. How do you explain that ?—Answer. In the first place, as a rule, there is more flour used in the winter months than in the summer months ; that is, the men eat more in cold weather : and, of course, with such a number of persons that makes quite a difference. Secondly, it depends a good deal on the character of the patients. Where many persons on low diet, taking beef-tea and things of that kind, they eat very little solid food ; and, of course, in that way you will use less flour, and the consumption of it will be less. If your patients that are brought in are brought in, as very often patients are brought in there, that are not very sick, many of the colored people who come in would get well outside, except that they have not the means of nourishment, of being cared for ; and that class, of course, really require very full diet, and receive it ; and, of course, there is quite an amount of food consumed in that way.

Q. Your explanation would be, then, that a less number of patients might use a larger amount of flour owing to their requiring more flour for their particular ailments than even a larger number when of a different character of patients ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that would vary from month to month ?—A. Yes, sir ; if we had a number of cases of typhoid fever, they would not use so much solid food, but liquid food. Another way would be this, for the same system was adopted while I was in charge of baking the flour outside : sometimes at the end of the month there would be a little balance owing to the baker, or perhaps he might want the flour, and we would send the flour a little in advance of the first of the month. We would order it near the end of the month, and about the 28th of the month five barrels would be sent to him, and they would lap over to the next month.

Q. That would account for such irregularities, comparing one month with another, or even the number of patients ?—A. Exactly ; and then in winter, as a rule, the patients consume more, and in feeding two hundred or three hundred persons that would make quite a difference.

Q. Did you consider it an economical way of supplying bread to the hospital to have it baked outside, pound for pound ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You found it to be so in your experience ?—A. When we adopted that plan, it was after, for several years, we had received bread from the commissary. After that was stopped we had to provide our own bread. We found, on calculating, that it would be much less expensive to have it done in this way than to employ a baker, build an oven, and have fuel and labor to attend to it. I think so still. It is decidedly economical.

Dr. Palmer also testified, upon this point, as follows :

As to the apparent variation of the amount of flour used in different months with the same number of patients, it often happens that at the end of one month the baker has received two or three barrels of flour more than he has returned bread for, which flour is used in the next month, and at the end of another month, perhaps, he may have furnished two or even three days' bread for which he has not received the flour. In this way a variation of five or six barrels may appear in the monthly statement, when the same number of barrels are used each month. But experience shows that the same number of patients in a hospital will eat more bread in some months than they do in others, particularly where the state of the health of the patients is varying, and where they are constantly changing, some going out and new ones coming in. The same is true of other articles of diet. More corn-meal is used some months than others for the same number of patients.

On the first of July, 1877, the hospital discontinued furnishing rations to patients in quarters, and to the children of the Colored Orphan Asylum, which before that time had formed a part of the institution, though the names were not dropped until August 1, and the names of patients in quarters were carried on the roll until October 1. This was owing to reduced appropriations, and separate appropriations made by Congress for the orphans, and resulted in a considerable diminution of the consumption of flour and other articles.

With regard to the contract for baking bread for the hospital, we are

inclined to think with Drs. Reyburn and Palmer that it is an economical arrangement, The hospital is on leased premises, on which it is not desirable to make improvements at government expense, and it is not a permanent institution, and has never been so regarded by Congress. If, however, Congress shall see fit to make an appropriation to build a bakery, there is no important objection to be urged. The bread now and usually furnished to the hospital is of good quality. The committee endeavored to arrive at the truth of the allegations that poor meats are furnished at the hospital. Directing attention to the testimony of Hoover, who furnishes it, and of other butchers who know his modes of dealing with the government at this and other institutions, and to that of the food-inspector, the committee say that it appears that twice, perhaps three times, during the extreme heats of last summer, a portion of the meat cooked at the hospital was slightly tainted from a temporary insufficiency of ice at night. These accidents, which might happen in any family, do not show that the meat was not good when delivered. The committee do not have the slightest doubt that the meats delivered at the hospital were good, merchantable meats.

Dr. Palmer's attention was called to the question as to the number of eggs used at the hospital, and he testified :

Q. Something is said here about the purchase of eggs for the hospital. It is said, "It appears that from 110 to 190 dozen eggs a month were purchased, an average of more than half a dozen a month to each inmate."—A. In regard to the eggs, I will say we use a large quantity of eggs as a proper article of diet for the sick, and find them an economical article of diet, too. We issue for the ward diet 276 eggs, 24 dozen per week; for custards and corn-starch we use 84 eggs a week; for the nurses' table 48, that is four dozen, on Sunday morning, and for the steward's table one dozen on Sunday morning; and for the dispensary, to make cod-liver emulsion and milk-punch, 28 eggs a week, making 508 eggs a week; that, multiplied by four, gives 2,032 eggs in the four weeks; divided by 12, it gives 170 dozen of eggs in four weeks. That is about the average.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. For a month would be a little more?—A. Yes, sir; some months it runs up from that and some months it runs down; that is about the average of the eggs we use here in the hospital.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Could you get along with less eggs than you use here?—A. We could, but I fear they would call it starvation diet.

On the question of eggs John T. Rabbitt testified :

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where is your place of business?—Answer. In the Centre Market.

Q. What business are you in?—A. Produce dealer.

Q. Do you furnish any articles to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What?—A. Chickens, eggs, butter, and cabbages when they are in season; but cabbages not being in season, kail at this time of the year. In summer time I furnish vegetables, such as sweet-potatoes, tomatoes, &c.

Q. How long have you been furnishing eggs and chickens to the hospital?—A. About seven years; between seven and eight years.

Q. You were furnishing them when Dr. Palmer went there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And have continued since?—A. Yes, sir; I have continued since.

Q. Do you furnish about the same amount of eggs in the season that you formerly did?—A. The same now as when I first went there: 30 dozen is the usual order.

Q. Where do you deliver them?—A. At the hospital. Sometimes the hospital wagon comes for them, and I put them in the wagon.

Q. Do you furnish good, fresh eggs?—A. Yes, sir; everything I send there is fresh. If it is not fresh they send it back again. They are very strict about the stuff out there.

Q. How do you deal with them as to prices compared with what you sell to other people?—A. For a heap less money. They buy by the quantity, and we generally put things to them a cent or two cents less.

Q. What do you get for eggs?—A. Thirteen cents a dozen this month.

Q. What is the average price this month to persons who do not take large quantities?—A. Fifteen cents retail.

Q. Do you pay anybody a percentage?—A. No, sir; I never had ten minutes' talk with any person out there. Dr. Palmer I never spoke to five minutes in my life; never saw him more than four or five times.

Q. You have no arrangement, and have not had any arrangement, by which anybody but the government was to profit by your trade?—A. That is all. Dr. Glennan sends the order.

Q. No understanding with Dr. Glennan that you are to deliver a less quantity than is charged to the government?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you deliver less than are charged?—A. No, sir; the order generally runs even, and when they send an order for fifty pounds, if the package is fifty-two or fifty-three I just send it, only charging according to the order.

Q. I understand that you deal fairly and honestly with the government?—A. Yes, sir; they get every pound. We weigh everything that goes out there.

The committee examined the pay-rolls of the hospital and found they sustained the following statement of Dr. Palmer:

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. We want a statement from those vouchers and an opportunity to examine fully the original vouchers, but I wish to ask another question now. It is stated in this paper that the doctors who made the investigation, at the request of Secretary Schurz, "find a difficulty in making it perfectly evident why they took no notice of the fact that an assistant engineer, discharged in May, 1875, was borne on the rolls at the rate of \$75 a month until October, 1875." What is the fact in reference to that?—A. When I came here there was an engineer and an assistant engineer. The assistant engineer was receiving \$25 a month; he and the engineer did not agree very well. I kept him along to take charge of the engine at such times as the engineer was off, and finally he was discharged in October, when his last voucher was paid, and he received every dollar of the money for which vouchers were drawn. Nobody else could draw his money but him.

Q. He was not discharged in May, but was discharged in October?—A. He was discharged in October.

Q. Did he work up to October?—A. He worked up to October.

Q. It says here at the rate of \$75 a month?—A. It was \$25 a month.

Upon the point of idiots and partially insane persons being in the hospital, like Tom Johnson, who needs constant watching, and is constantly watched, to keep him from mischief, the committee report that he and all such came down from the old contraband camps, and there is no law for disposing of them otherwise than by retaining them at this hospital. As the insane did not become such in the District, they cannot be taken in at the St. Elizabeth Insane Asylum, and applications for such admission have been refused. No such persons are now admitted at the Freedmen's Hospital, and its patients, except these legacies of the past, are made up of indigent sick persons, regardless of color. There is no discrimination on account of color either in the reception or treatment of patients, or in employing help at the hospital. The proportion of original occupants is over one-third of the whole number.

On the point of bodies being buried on the hospital grounds, much insisted upon by several of the complaining witnesses, the committee find that some of the students had caused to be buried portions of a human skeleton, from which the flesh had been removed by dissection, being the part of a skull, pelvis, and thorax, and some other small bones, for the purpose of maceration, and with intent to preserve them as specimens, as is the custom of medical students. The doctors knew nothing of the burying. The committee called Dr. D. C. Patterson, the coroner of the District, whose testimony will be found on page 62. He stated that the bones had nothing on them except such small particles of muscular matter as were left from dissecting, and there was no odor. They were bones preserved by a medical student. Dr. P. T. Keene, coroner, page 64, testified that he was present; that "my jurisdiction over the matter extended to the discovery whether there was a nuisance injurious to health on the premises. I found that the bones were not

offensive, and for that reason took no official action." Perhaps this matter is not worth the space devoted to it, as neither of the officers of the hospital knew anything about it even if it had been the actual burial of a body as alleged, while in fact it was nothing of the kind, as shown by the officers of the law qualified by experience, medically and otherwise, to speak understandingly.

In conclusion the committee say that after investigation into the management of the affairs of the Freedmen's Hospital, as shown by the testimony herewith submitted, they concur with the information officially laid before them by the Secretary of the Interior, in the form of two former reports, that the affairs of this institution are well conducted by its present head, Dr. Palmer, and his medical assistants, Drs. Purvis and Glennan. It would be a misfortune to the institution to lose the services of these gentlemen, and no others who would be likely to take their places for the low salaries paid to them would have the skill and experience that these men have, or administer the affairs of the hospital so ably. The appropriations for the hospital are not sufficient to put it and keep it up to grade of a first-class hospital. The buildings are not suitable for such an one. More nurses could be used to advantage; a special superintendent, under direction of the surgeon in charge, to watch over the details of internal administration and keep the nurses and other employés under daily and nightly surveillance, and a larger fund for clothing, so as to burn up all the clothing worn by patients on their admission, and cloth them anew, as well as other provision for idiots and demented persons, would enable the surgeon-in-chief to bring up the character of the hospital. But all the money appropriated for the hospital seems to be well applied, and as good results produced as possible with the means furnished.

TESTIMONY

TAKEN BY THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

CONSISTING OF

SENATORS SARGENT, ALLISON, AND EATON,

RELATIVE TO

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL.

WASHINGTON, *Thursday, February 7, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

Dr. G. S. PALMER sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer. I am surgeon-in-chief.

Q. When did your connection with it commence?—A. On the 20th of March, 1875.

Q. Have you held that office ever since?—A. I have.

Q. Who was your predecessor?—A. Dr. Robert Reyburn.

Q. Who are the other principal officers of the institution?—A. Dr. C. B. Purvis and Dr. P. Glennan.

Q. What position does Doctor Purvis hold?—A. He holds the position called, sometimes, ward physician.

Q. And the other?—A. Executive officer.

Q. Is there any limit by law to the number of physicians?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Are there any other physicians employed about the hospital except those you have mentioned?—A. No physicians at present. There was another physician when I went there. Doctor Harris was then serving in the capacity of physician there, and Dr. A. T. Augusta was also there for some months—over a year, indeed.

Q. Have you reduced the number of physicians?—A. I have.

Q. On whose order are patients admitted to the hospital?—A. That of the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. In every case?—A. In every case.

Q. Have you or has any other officer of the institution discretion as to the class of patients you receive?—A. Only myself. If a patient comes there who comes within the limits of the hospital, that is to say,

a proper person, I recommend him to the Secretary, and the Secretary gives the order.

Q. You do not receive patients in advance of such order?—A. Only in cases of emergency, where there is distress or anything of that kind.

Q. And you represent the facts to the Secretary, and his order is conclusive whether they remain or leave?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many patients are there now at the hospital?—A. Two hundred and twenty-six.

Q. Is that about an average number of what you have had there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are the limitations you speak of as to those who are received?—A. That they shall be needing hospital-treatment and absolutely poor; that is, impecunious, unable to take care of themselves.

Q. Is any difference made on account of color or sex?—A. No difference of color or sex.

Q. Do you know what the origin of the hospital was?—A. The hospital was established under the Freedmen's Bureau, for the care of the freedmen and refugees and those persons who were brought here from various hospitals when that institution was broken up. When that occurred, there were persons whom they were unable to discharge from the various hospitals that belonged to that institution, and they were collected here into this one hospital in this District; some brought from Kentucky, some from North Carolina, and different States in which those hospitals had existed.

Q. Those hospitals were connected with the contraband camps, as they were called?—A. Yes, sir; and the Freedmen's Bureau.

Q. Were there any idiotic persons among those?—A. There were; six or seven such persons were among those people that were brought here, and are still here in the hospital.

Q. Are patients with infectious diseases received?—A. No contagious diseases. There is a distinction between infection and contagion; some of the diseases that are treated in the hospital may be, under certain circumstances, infectious, but as a general rule no cases of infectious or contagious diseases are received. There are certainly no contagious diseases.

Q. Is care taken with persons having infectious diseases about their having communication with other patients?—A. There is. They are not mixed up miscellaneously, but are isolated; that is to say, they are placed in different parts of the wards that they will not communicate their diseases. But the infectious character of the disease is removed as soon as possible; that is to say, they are cleaned and put under treatment so that there is no danger from infection after they have been there a few hours.

Q. How many cooks have you in that establishment?—A. Five all the time and six part of the time.

Q. Have you selected those cooks yourself or has there been a change in them during the last three months?—A. There has been no change in the main cooks there for seven or eight years.

Q. That is, you kept on the cooks you found there?—A. I have kept the cooks I found there.

Q. Are those cooks cleanly and competent?—A. They are competent and tidy.

Q. Have they been recently more careful about their cooking than they were four or five months or a year ago?—A. Not that I know of or have discovered.

Q. The subcommittee the other day examined the dinner upon the

table, which we found upon our visit there. Was that a fair sample of the dinners as they have been?—A. That is the dinner that we have every Saturday—that was the day you were there—every Saturday since I have been there and before, because we have the same bill of fare that was in use when I went there.

Q. Was that dinner any better cooked than ordinarily?—A. No better cooked than ordinarily.

Q. State what the fare was that we found there that day, or rather, of your Saturday dinner?—A. The Saturday dinner is beef-stew, potatoes, and bread; and soup is made with the stew. That is the mess-room diet. Then about one-half of the patients are fed in the wards; have their meals carried to them on trays; about one hundred and ten or thereabouts, and their diet is anything that the physician thinks they need; that is, it has a very wide range. They have custards, they have beef-tea, they have soup, they have toast, and any kind of pudding the physician seems to think best; a large variety, which I cannot think of now.

Q. That is to say, for patients who are in delicate health?—A. Sick persons in the wards.

Q. You vary their food according to their necessities?—A. According to the case.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. As a physician you treat those people who need care in their diet as you would me in my house? Is that what you mean?—A. Exactly.

Q. If it was beef-tea, if it was toast, if it was chicken-broth, or whatever it might be that you thought the patient needed, you would give?—A. We prescribe the diet the same as medicine; that is to say, after getting through with the prescriptions of medicine then we prescribe the diet and put it down on a slip of paper and send that to the kitchen.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Has that been so before the last three months?—A. It has been so always; since I have known the institution, at any rate.

Q. Do you furnish this food in sufficient quantities to satisfy hunger?—A. An abundance of it. As proof of that, there is a surplus of food each day, and the poor people of the neighborhood come in and get it. We issue it in the form of scraps. We supply from five to fifteen families with the surplus food; that is to say, on some days there is enough left for some fifteen families to get little scraps. We send down a paper to the steward to give such and such a person some scraps. He gives them, say, one pound of pieces of bread and a pint of soup, as things may be left from the dinner. There is always more or less left from the dinner.

Q. Are these poor families to whom they are supplied?—A. Poor people, coming there in rags and tatters, and who live around in the neighborhood or anywhere in town—beggars.

Q. That is furnished without price?—A. Yes, sir; that is the surplus food which has been on the table, and is given to them the same as you would from anybody's house in the form of cold victuals.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. State the location of the hospital.—A. It is located above the boundary, between Fifth and Seventh streets.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What buildings does it occupy?—A. The buildings that are leased from Howard University.

Q. How many buildings are there? Describe them.—A. There is a large brick building four stories high; I should think about 80 by 60 feet. That is a rough guess. The ground occupies two squares between Fifth and Seventh streets, above the boundary, just outside of the boundary of the city. Then there are four wooden buildings in the form of barracks, two stories high, about 120 feet long, and, I should say, about 30 feet wide. Each of them contains two wards. Those wards contain about 30 beds each. That makes eight wards, and there is a capacity of 320 beds. There are not quite as many beds. We estimate the capacity of the hospital at 300 beds.

Q. Recurring again to the question of food, what care is taken in purchasing proper food; your meat, for instance?—A. I purchase the meat by contract made at the beginning of each six months. I issue proposals or go around and see different butchers and see what propositions I can get, and then take the one that seems to be the best for the interest of the institution.

Q. Do you get the lowest market-price?—A. Yes, sir; the lowest market-price for the quality.

Q. What is the quality of the meat which you buy?—A. The meat is not the first-class meat, but good, sound, wholesome meat, such as makes good roasts, good soups and stews and steaks, and it is all of good quality.

Q. Is it food adapted to the hospital?—A. The food best adapted, economically, and for a hospital.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You say you contract with the butcher every six months?—A. Yes, sir; for six months.

Q. Does he furnish you for six months at a given rate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But there may be very great changes in the value of beef in that time. Beef may be worth in the month of January twelve cents a pound, and it may be worth in March two cents more or two cents less.—A. In making his proposition he takes into consideration the probabilities of the market.

Q. Suppose that there should be an increased value, where are you then?—A. I am on the agreed value.

Q. Suppose it decreases in price?—A. Then I have to pay the contract-price. For the last year I have paid eight cents a pound for fresh meat. This year I am getting it for seven cents. That was the understanding and agreement with the butcher at the beginning of the year, and then at the beginning of July again, and the price has not varied. It has been the same all the while. Sometimes I get the advantage and sometimes he does.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. As a rule, do you get things at the lowest market-price?—A. I am sure of that, because I make it a business to inquire diligently what the market is.

Q. An allegation has been made that you "buy beef's heads and legs, often putrid, and chop these up and have them cooked into odious messes." What truth is there in that statement?—A. No truth at all; there is never any beef's head, or anything else bad, that comes into the hospital that I know of. There are no bad pieces of meat; indeed, they are excluded by the agreement.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Who superintends the procuring of the meats?—A. The meats are delivered by the butcher.

Q. But to whom?—A. To the steward.

Q. To him personally?—A. To him personally. The steward receives all the meat, examines it, weighs it, and sees that it corresponds to the order. He knows the order that is given and the amount each day, and his business is to take it right on to the scales and weigh it and examine it carefully, and then put it into the ice-chest and issue it to the cooks.

Q. Who is he?—A. His name is Chapman.

Q. How long has he been there?—A. I found him there. He has been there about four or five years, I should say.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. With regard to your pickled pork and beef, what quality of that do you buy?—A. We buy good, sound meat. What we call No. 1 Western shoulders is one quality; and of hams of the first quality we use a good many. Then the pork has all to be sound, good pork.

Q. Do you have these things inspected to see that they are?—A. They are inspected by the inspector in the market. The inspector in the market examines the meat before it leaves the stall.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Of course it may turn out that your pickled pork is not what you thought; and you have the privilege, beyond all question, I suppose, if you open the cask and find that it is imperfect, to immediately send it back or cause it to be taken back?—A. I do send it back whenever there is anything not according to the agreement; and that thing has been done. Meat has been sent back because it was not according to quality.

Q. Is your salted beef, as we call it in New England, brought from the West in barrels?—A. We do not use salt beef, but corned beef. The corned beef is all made here.

Q. I was about to ask whether the corned beef or salted beef was corned here or brought in barrels?—A. The corned beef is all prepared and corned by the butchers.

Q. A certain piece?—A. A certain piece delivered.

Q. Understand me. Is there a contract as to what that corned beef shall be—from what part of the creature?—A. No sir; there is no contract as to that.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is it freshly pickled or corned for you?—A. Yes, sir; it is.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. How often do you have your supplies of corned beef brought to you?—A. There are two corned-beef dinners in the week. The corned beef is brought in the day that it is used. It is never kept over.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you use mackerel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you buy that, and what is its quality?—A. We buy mackerel by the barrel, No. 2's, and they are good quality inspected mackerel.

Q. Are those inspected by the inspectors at the market before being delivered?—A. No; they are inspected where they are put up—where they are prepared for market. They always have the inspector's mark on them, and we are governed by that, of course.

Q. Are those you use good?—A. We have found them good, I believe. The steward can tell better about that. There may have been one barrel returned, perhaps. My impression is that there has been a

barrel or two returned during the time I have been there. If they are found not to be good, his orders are to send them back at once.

Q. Is the kind of bread we found at the hospital last Saturday the average bread?—A. The average bread since I have been there.

Q. Cooked by the same cook?—A. By the same baker and of the same quality of flour, as near as we get it. We vary the quality of the flour a little, according to the market, but we pay a good price for flour, from \$7 to \$8 in the years that have gone by. The bakers require two brands to make good bread. We buy the flour of the largest dealer in the city, at wholesale prices, and send it to the baker, and he issues to us a pound of bread for a pound of flour.

Q. Who is your baker?—A. His name is Kaiser, a German.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Where does he live?—A. At the corner of O and Sixth streets.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is he carrying on business aside from baking for you?—A. Yes, sir; a regular bakery.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Who is your butcher?—A. William H. Hoover.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is he a man of considerable business?—A. He keeps a stall in the market and does a large business in the market, and has ever since I have known him and for years before.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Is he the only contractor you have?—A. No, sir. Mr. John Kelly contracted one six months since I have been there.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What do you do about the hominy that you use? What care do you take in selecting that?—A. We order a first-class article, and if it is musty, or there is anything bad about it, we send it back, do not receive it. Hominy has proved to be poor several times, and we have always sent it back in those cases and had good in its place.

Q. How liberally do you distribute potatoes to the mess-table?—A. Every day.

Q. Do you give as many potatoes as they want?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A Mr. Johnson states that "a solitary potato in its jacket, about the size of a hen's egg, is allotted to each patient at dinner;" what truth is there in that?—A. That is totally untrue. So far as the jacket is concerned, sometimes the potatoes are not peeled; they are sent up so that they crack open in a nice condition. We do not propose to peel them. They keep warm better when we send them to the wards with the peeling on. The potatoes are always of good quality; and if they want one or five, they get them. If they do not happen to have enough, the nurses always come back and get more. There is no question at all about that.

Q. What do you furnish in the shape of tea and coffee?—A. For coffee, we get a good quality of Rio coffee and buy it by the sack. Of tea, we get the black and the green tea; sometimes for the sick we have the tea green; and that is bought in quantities somewhat according to the necessity; sometimes we buy it by the chest and sometimes in smaller quantities.

Q. How about the quality?—A. It is always of good quality.

Q. Are the tea and coffee well made?—A. The tea and coffee are well made. The coffee is half a pound to the gallon.

Q. Can you estimate the cost of the provision of each person a day?—A. In the present year the amount allowed for subsistence is \$1,500 a month. That would be for twelve months \$18,000. At 250 patients and nurses, which the hospital averages, that allows twenty cents a day for subsistence per head.

Q. Then a statement that the cost per day is seven cents is entirely erroneous, is it?—A. Entirely so.

Q. Who handles the money of the institution that is expended for provisions, &c.?—A. The Secretary of the Interior.

Q. Does any money pass through your hands or those of any officer of the institution?—A. Not a dollar.

Q. What is the system in regard to it?—A. I have the vouchers here and can show you just exactly how the whole thing is done.

Q. Describe it.—A. I make the purchases, examine the goods, and examine the bills which are presented for the goods. I then send each month a statement of the expenses of the hospital and an abstract of each man's account and approve it, and it is paid at the Interior Department. For instance, here is Mr. Galt's bill for flour in the month of February, 1877.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Mr. Galt, the wholesale dealer?—A. Yes, sir; W. M. Galt & Co.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. William M. Galt & Co. furnish you flour. Here I see in the voucher you have just handed me three items, one \$136, one \$133, and one \$58, making in all, \$327, February 28, 1877. Was the flour comprised in these items bought at the lowest market-price?—A. At the lowest market-price. The way that is done is this: He comes every month and tells me what he will furnish flour the next month for, and I then go down to Barbour & Hamilton and several of the other wholesale dealers and find out what they will furnish it for. Sometimes I go before I see him, sometimes afterward, but before I give him an answer. Then, after I have found out what the probabilities are for flour for that month, I say to Mr. Galt, "I will take your flour," or not; but as a general rule I have taken it from him because he has dealt square according to the market.

Q. Has there been any understanding between him and you that a larger price should be charged than the market allowed in order that you might make a profit from it?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Or that you and he might divide?—A. No talk of the kind. There is nothing of the kind.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. There could be nothing of the kind without dishonorable conduct on the part of Galt & Co.?—A. Certainly not.

Q. They are large and reputable dealers, are they not?—A. Yes, sir; the largest flour dealers in the city.

Q. Is that the general course of your dealing with other dealers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. This bill, being so certified by you as correct, goes to the Secretary of the Interior?—A. Yes, sir; and the disbursing officer of the Interior Department pays it; and there is a receipt attached to it, which is not filled out on this. My clerk fills out this receipt, "Received from R.

Joseph, disbursing officer, the above amount," and then they sign a duplicate. They sign these vouchers in duplicate. I keep one and they collect their pay on the other, and that other is kept in the Interior Department.

Q. These accounts are subsequently audited, according to the usual course of business in the Treasury?—A. I do not know what becomes of them. That is the end of my knowledge of them.

Q. What is your compensation at the hospital?—A. The first two years and a half it was \$200 a month. Under the present arrangement the law itemized the expenditures, so that it is only \$1,400 a year the present year.

Q. Do you receive any compensation from the Howard University?—A. Nothing at all.

Q. This is all the compensation you receive for your services?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You give your time to this hospital?—A. I give my whole time to the hospital.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Have you no outside practice at all?—A. Occasionally I have a few old friends who come and I attend them, but it does not amount to anything hardly.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You are there at the hospital every day?—A. Every day unless when I have been sick, and that has been but a few times ever since I have been there.

Q. How many hours are you there?—A. I am there from nine o'clock till four or five generally, sometimes in the night, and Sundays the same.

Q. Do you visit all parts of the hospital every day?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is your course in reference to that matter?—A. I visit and have the charge of two wards, the two sick female wards. I visit them every day and prescribe for them; enter all my prescriptions in a book which is there to be seen; and then, if there is any important case in any of the other wards, I go and see that case; and if there is anything that seems to require my attention in any other part of the hospital, I go to it. I go to the cook-room and to the engine-room every day. On Saturdays I make a thorough inspection of the hospital with the other physicians. We all go at twelve o'clock or one o'clock, the same as we did the other day when you were there, through the whole of the hospital, look at everything—water-closets, and beds, and everything in the hospital entirely—every Saturday, and there has been no let-up on that since I have been there.

Q. What has been your education and experience or practice as a physician?—A. I graduated from the Maine Medical College in 1838, practiced in the city of Gardiner, State of Maine, till the war broke out, and then I went into the Army, and was first a regimental surgeon and then a surgeon of volunteers, and was assigned to duty in various parts of the Army. I had charge of Lincoln Hospital, in this city, one of the largest hospitals at the time in the city. The Surgeon-General, at the time of the battle of Gettysburg, told me he wanted experienced men in the field, and wanted me to go up to Gettysburg, which I did; and I took charge of hospitals in the Cumberland Valley under Dr. King. I then went from there to Saint Louis, and was superintendent of hospitals in the vicinity of Saint Louis under Dr. Mills, who was afterward

medical inspector-general of the Army. I have a letter from him, by the way. Then I went to Annapolis and had charge of Saint John's College Hospital from that time till the war terminated, and at the same time I was on the board of examiners for officers. There were two boards in the country, one at Cincinnati and one at Annapolis, for the examination of officers to return to hospital, to be sent to the field, or to be discharged, and I performed the duty of medical officer on the board in the summer at the same time that I had charge of Saint John's College Hospital. That was at the end of the war. Then the hospital was broken up. The first two years I was in the field. I was at the battle of Antietam.

Q. From the time you were relieved from duty until you took charge of this hospital, what were you doing?—A. I was at home in the State of Maine, in poor health, but I was engaged in various matters. I was in the legislature there a couple of winters, and I was practicing somewhat, as far as my health would admit, and doing some little city business and things of that sort.

Q. I understand you to say that the cooks who have cooked during the last three months at the hospital, you found there and have kept on?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they as good cooks as are ordinarily employed in the large hospitals with which you have been connected?—A. Yes, sir. They are as good cooks as we generally find in that class of hospitals.

Q. It has been alleged that the bath-rooms and water closets attached to the male wards of the hospital are kept in an offensive condition. What is the fact in reference to that?—A. The fact is that it is not true so far as I know. The physicians in charge of the wards have instructions to keep their wards in good condition, and they are competent persons to do so. The nurses are instructed to clean their water-closets every morning and to sweep their wards, to wash them twice a week, all of which is done, and the nurses are competent to do it; they say they do it, and whenever I go into the wards I find such things are done.

Q. Are the slops emptied into the bath-tubs?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Does the water system of the city extend there?—A. The water is pumped up by the steam-engine into a large tank and flows into each ward freely. There is plenty of water.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Are the utensils used by the cooks washed in the wash-tubs?—A. No, sir; there is an iron sink for that use.

Q. Is it used for that purpose?—A. It is used for that purpose.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. As you do not examine but once a week, you cannot speak absolutely of your own knowledge in regard to that matter?—A. I guarded that by saying that when I go there I find such things have been done.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You have some idiotic patients, and other persons perhaps of not entirely sound mental condition. Are such persons very cleanly about water-closets and bath-rooms?—A. They require most careful watching. They are filthy from the very nature of their infirmities, and it requires that they shall be carefully watched in that respect. Some of them even would soil themselves if they were not watched in the beds. That, of course, occurs among sick people.

Q. An accident of that kind occurring your general rules are designed to prevent if possible?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But it sometimes happens?—A. We have rubber clothes to place under the bed whenever we suspect that anything of that kind is going to take place, so as to protect the bed and protect the patient.

Q. You use all the precautions that you can to prevent defilement of the beds, the water closets, or bath-rooms?—A. Yes, sir; all the precautions that can be used.

Q. It is alleged against you that "the furniture, fixtures, and utensils of the wards are uncomfortable, dilapidated, mean, and unsuited to the service." Has Congress made any appropriation to refurnish the hospital?—A. Not a dollar.

Q. What furniture have you, and what is its condition?—A. We have the ordinary iron bedstead of the Army. We have straw sacks and hair mattresses, and ordinary sheets and blankets and coverlids—all of good quality. Of course the iron bedsteads are as good as they ever were. We also have chairs and benches and tables in the wards. We have a table for every two beds.

Q. Where did this furniture originally come from? Do you know of your own knowledge?—A. I do not know; I found it there.

Q. You use such furniture as the government furnished you at the time you went there, and no appropriations have been made by Congress for any other?—A. I use just the same as I found there, and I never had any means to buy new. I have replaced chairs frequently when they got worn out, from the miscellaneous fund. Then, as to mattresses, I buy ticking and have the hair steamed whenever the mattresses get soiled. Sometimes we have to throw away mattresses when they get bloody and soiled from operations. Then we are obliged to have them condemned. The ticking and the hair I have put into the steam-box and had them steamed and reworked up into new mattresses. We make our own mattresses in that way.

Q. You do what you can with such furniture and material as the Government furnishes you?—A. Yes, sir; we make the best of it.

Q. Is it ordinarily comfortable and adapted to the use?—A. It is ordinarily comfortable and adapted to that class of hospital.

Q. Are "the beds and bedding and the wainscoting of the walls infested with vermin"?—A. Occasionally water-bugs get into the wainscoting, and occasionally there will be vermin brought in by patients. The patients come from the lowest grades of society, and a great many of them are in a very filthy condition when they come in; they bring in vermin. Our rule is, and I think it is very strictly carried out, to take the patient, under such circumstances, and cut his hair off close to the scalp, in order to remove all the vermin from the head, and put on ointment to keep them from returning or to kill the nits, and then to have the patient thoroughly washed and put on the hospital clothing; and his own clothing, if filthy and bad, not worth washing, is burned up; if it is worth washing, it is sent to the wash-house, put under steam, and thoroughly cleansed.

Q. Do you use efforts to keep down vermin in the hospital?—A. We use the exterminator very frequently for the purpose of destroying these water-bugs or roaches, as they are sometimes called, and keep them down reasonably. I do not know what better term to use than that. They are pretty troublesome.

Q. Does any other vermin than the water-bug infest the hospital to any degree?—A. No, sir.

Q. This water-bug or roach is what is found in the private houses of this city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You use the same means they do in private houses to get rid of them?—A. Just the same as I use in my own house.

Q. Do you have any consumptive or asthmatic patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where are they put in the hospital?—A. They are in the general wards, care being taken not to have too many of them in connection with each other, so as to injure the moral condition of each other.

Q. What effect does their being in the wards have upon other patients?—A. No serious effect.

Q. Does their coughing deprive them of sleep or disturb their rest at night?—A. Sometimes it might, as would be natural.

Q. Is there any remedy for that with the materials at your hand?—A. The remedy is that when a patient has a bad cough we try to allay it with medicines, and do so as far forth as the medicines are adapted to the purpose.

Q. Is it possible for you to isolate them from the others?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why not? Why can you not assign them to private rooms?—A. The expense of doing so would be greater than it seems to me is contemplated by the appropriation. Nurses would have to be supplied for them, and it would require too large a number of nurses.

Q. Have you not the means to do it?—A. We have not the means to do it.

Q. Are there many of this class of consumptives and asthmatic persons?—A. There are not a great many asthmatics, but the number of consumptives is quite large. I would say here that among the consumptive patients there is only now and then a case that is at all annoying. As a general rule the consumptive patients sleep quietly in certain stages of the disease; but, of course, they cough more or less.

Q. A statement has been made that you allow private persons to keep cows on the hospital premises at government expense. What is the truth in regard to that?—A. It is not true. There has no cow ever been kept on the hospital premises at government expense. The assistant surgeon has kept a cow in the lower yard, and fed it himself. It has been there for the convenience of keeping it. That is all. He has had the opportunity to keep it there.

Q. Merely using the inclosure?—A. Using the inclosure; that is to say, there is a good deal of waste land where this cow runs, and she goes under the shed at nights, but gets nothing from the government at all.

Q. Is there more than one?—A. No, sir. Dr. Purvis will answer for himself as to that. He had a cow there a little while, but it was for a short time and under the same circumstances.

Q. No one of them has been of any charge to the government in any way?—A. No, sir. I asked the hostler and those who had charge of the feed, and they told me the parties furnished their own feed. There was no feed furnished by the government.

Q. How do you get milk for the hospital?—A. I purchase it from parties who bring it there, at a specific price for each month.

Q. What do you pay per gallon for milk?—A. At the present time we pay 30 cents. I have paid as high as 38 cents, and I think as high as 40 cents, since I have been there.

Q. And how low?—A. In January, 1877, I paid 40 cents; that was a year ago. I think when I went there I found the price was 50 cents,

and I continued it for a while. I have been gradually reducing it until it is now down to 30 cents. I get a good quality. I test it by the taste and also by the lactometer.

Q. The milk of about how many cows do you use for the whole hospital, do you think?—A. I am using now ten gallons a day. I have used as high as thirteen gallons a day, and as low, perhaps, as seven, depending upon the character of the diseases of the patients. Sometimes we have a class of patients who require more milk, and the way that is done is that the physicians order the amount of milk in any ward which they want the patients to have, and if it falls a little short for two or three days I order an increase in the supply of milk, and if I find the milk is a little more than I want, it is diminished. It varies from week to week.

Q. Is that a low price for milk that you are now paying?—A. It is, I should say, about a fair price for a good article.

Q. It is alleged that you "permit the Howard University and the Howard mansion to be supplied with water at government expense." Is the Howard mansion supplied with water?—A. I will show you with regard to that. The lease of the hospital property from the Howard University has a clause in it which makes it obligatory upon us to pump water one hour a day to the main building. What buildings receive it from that I do not know. There is a large tank in the main building of the Howard University, and there is a clause in the lease which requires that we should pump it there one hour a day with the engine, and that has been done.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. As part of the rent?—A. Yes, sir; it is part of the rent. It will be understood, of course, that the university own the engines, and we rent them and furnish the fuel.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. The stipulation in the lease is—

"4th. To put the engine in said hospital in good repair and direct the use of the same one hour per day (Sundays excepted) for pumping water to the main building of the said Howard University."

That is a contract in the lease between the university and the government, executed on the part of the government by "G. S. Palmer, surgeon in chief Freedmen's Hospital, for Interior Department of the United States." This is the lease which is still operating, is it? Has it been varied in any way?—A. It has never been varied until the present day. The present fiscal year the bill making the appropriation required that there should be only \$2,000 paid for rent, instead of \$4,000.

Q. Congress appropriated but \$2,000?—A. Yes, sir; that is all.

Q. Otherwise the lease remains as originally made?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The Freedmen's Hospital is the tenant of the Howard University?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And under this lease, which is dated in 1875, this pumping is done?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You pump one hour a day into that tank?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they use the water as they see fit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You never pump more than an hour a day?—A. No, sir. Sometimes when the pump is not in good order the engineer makes up by pumping a few minutes over, so as to do what is required to be done in the hour when the pump is in good condition.

Q. Do you know what the cost per day is of that pumping?—A. The cost per day is estimated from 100 to 200 pounds of coal, and the coal is

worth from 25 to 30 cents a hundred. This present year it is worth about 25 cents a hundred, and in former years it has been about 30 cents. It is cheaper this year.

Q. Then it costs about 40 or 60 cents a day?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. That is, it costs that much to comply with this lease?—A. Yes, sir. I think I have put the cost pretty large. In regard to that, it takes a certain amount of coal and wood to get up the steam which is necessary for the hospital purposes, and also it takes another amount of coal to do the work necessary for the hospital. When the steam is up, and it becomes time to use the pump for the university, it does not require over 100 pounds of coal in a day to run it through that hour that the steam is up. We are also compelled to pay our engineer just the same. The pump belongs to them, and it costs the amount of coal which is consumed in that hour, after the steam is up.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You think it would not be over a quarter of a dollar a day?—A. I calculate about 20 cents a day.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. It is necessary to have this engine in operation every day?—A. Every day for hospital purposes.

Q. How many hours a day is it used for hospital purposes?—A. The engineer reports about nine, but it is not used all the time for that. He pumps his tank full; he washes, and saws wood, and cooks. There is some steam used in cooking. We keep up a gentle steam perhaps from seven to nine hours, low-pressure steam.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. It is alleged that you have abrogated the custom of employing a night nurse for each ward, and compel one man during the night to take charge of two wards containing at least sixty patients, and also to attend to four fires in cold weather, which it is alleged are "onerous duties and cannot properly be discharged by a single individual." Please state the facts in regard to that.—A. The fact in regard to that is that I kept the same nurses during the duty in those two wards that I found there, and therefore I did not abrogate the custom. The nurse is assisted always by convalescent patients, which is the custom in free hospitals like that, and they do assist him. Whenever any emergency arises the nurse is assisted by convalescent patients, and if he ever complains and wants assistance he can get it. Dr. Purvis has charge of those wards and he can give you the details in that respect.

Q. Are the patients under that system sufficiently taken care of day and night?—A. They are sufficiently taken care of day and night.

Q. Do you keep a light in the wards at night?—A. We keep a small taper-light burning.

Q. And is the nurse in the ward awake at night looking after the comforts and necessities of the patients?—A. Always.

Q. Can any person in distress call out for help without getting it under this system?—A. Never.

Q. What is your custom, where a person dies in the hospital, about removing the body to the dead-house? How soon after he dies is the corpse removed?—A. As soon as convenient after death takes place. The order is to put a screen around a person who is apparently dying or going to die soon, and after the person dies the body is dressed on the

bed where he dies, and then is taken by two men, on a stretcher, to the dead-house.

Q. Is that done decently and in order?—A. Done decently and in order. The instructions are always to do so.

Q. Do you find that the appropriation of \$40,000 this year and \$45,000 last year is necessarily expended in the management and care of the hospital?—A. Yes, sir, it is required; and I have to be careful about recommending patients to the Secretary, in order not to get in too many so as to overrun the different items of appropriation.

Q. Is the hospital sustained solely by Congressional appropriations?—A. Entirely.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. The patients who go there do not pay?—A. They pay nothing. One case, I will remark, has occurred since the former examination. A man came in; and after he had been there I found he was able to pay. I allowed him to pay ten dollars, which is ready to be turned into the Interior Department when the proper time comes.

Q. Is that the only case?—A. The only case where any man has ever paid. The man came with a cancer on his lip. I think he is employed about the Capitol now. We removed the cancer and kept him there about two weeks and I told him he might pay. He seemed able to pay. That was the only case. Then, with regard to certain other cases, I would say that while the hospital was under the care of the Secretary of War persons from the District were admitted to the hospital on the condition of paying sixty cents a day, and the District poor were at one time all quartered there, or at least a large number of them. That accumulated quite a little fund, which fund has laid to the credit of the hospital ever since as a hospital fund.

Q. Where?—A. In the Interior Department.

Q. How is it used?—A. I draw upon it occasionally whenever there is any emergency and the regular fund does not seem to be sufficient to meet the current expenses. I have drawn on it about three times, I think; once for coal for the whole year, and last year for certain articles of clothing, and this year for the payment of the additional surgeon not provided for in the appropriation.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. How many surgeons are provided for in the appropriation?—A. Two.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. What is the amount of this fund?—A. I do not know officially; but I have a private memorandum of it, and I think it is about four or five thousand dollars.

Q. You say you draw upon it?—A. Yes sir.

Q. That is, of course, a draft subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior?—A. Yes, sir. I draw upon the Secretary of the Interior just the same as I draw the other, only I mark it "Hospital fund," and it is paid just the same.

Q. Is it paid as a matter of course, or is it paid if the Secretary of the Interior approves your views about it?—A. It must be on the approval of my views, of course. I know nothing about it further than that. I never have anything to do with a voucher after I approve it. The fund was transferred by the Surgeon-General to the Interior Department. It accumulated, most of it, before four or five years ago; but since I have been there there have been but few patients admitted

from the city. Whenever those patients were admitted by order of the Commissioners, I would make out at the end of the month a list of their names and send it down, and the time they were there, and they would give me a warrant for the amount. That warrant I would turn into the Interior Department. I do not handle the money at all myself. Mr. Butler has also sent persons there—I found that custom existing—persons here waiting who belonged to the National Soldiers' Home. They would be here waiting for a day or two, sometimes a week. About once a quarter I would send a bill for the amount the board of those patients came to. Finally we got it down to 40 cents, and those bills are paid by a draft, which I turn over to the Secretary of the Interior always, and that goes to make up this hospital fund.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. That is what you call the reserved hospital fund?—A. Dr. Purvis was in the hospital before I was, and knows more about what took place early than I do.

Q. Have any lunatics or idiots been admitted since you went there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Those who are there you found there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the treatment of those? Are they treated as patients in charge of nurses?—A. Yes, sir; they are treated as patients in charge of nurses and watched carefully.

Q. Is there any violence necessary toward them or is it used?—A. No, sir; no violence is necessary. Sometimes they are obliged to be restrained on account of tearing their clothes. They have sometimes to be held or, in a few instances, their hands have been tied for a while during the day-time.

Q. Do they have the same food as others?—A. The same food. It is carried to them on trays; served to them the same, excepting that they have tin ware instead of delf, because they would break it.

Q. Have you any power to discharge such persons without the order of the Secretary of the Interior or his approval?—A. I have not.

Q. Is there any institution to which they can be sent?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. You have some lunatics there, persons of unsound mind, have you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why can they not be sent to the Government Insane Asylum?—A. They were persons whose insanity occurred before they came into the District, and there is a provision in the admission of persons into the insane asylum that requires persons to make oath that their disease came upon them while they were residents of the District, and for that reason it is difficult to get them into the insane asylum. One, before I came, was sent there and they sent her back.

Q. What connection is there between the hospital and Howard University, so far as the employment of students is concerned? Please explain that matter.—A. The medical department of the Howard University has its rooms in the same building with the offices of the hospital. Those rooms are reserved in the lease. But aside from that they are distinct institutions. They are distinct institutions any way, but they have their rooms in the same building with the hospital offices. It is the custom to appoint medical students and allow them to stay in the hospital—one, or two, or three, as the case may be—and assign them to certain duties in the hospital, and allow them to live there as compensation for those duties that they do.

Q. Was there a chaplain of the hospital when you went there?—A.

There was a chaplain employed in the hospital when I went there who had a salary of \$100 a month, and a musician at a salary of \$8 a month.

Q. With board also?—A. No, sir, without board; that is, they had a room and quarters there, fire and lights. I found that was an expense which did not seem to be needed. The people did not want that kind of service, for they are religiously inclined always, and there are plenty of volunteer preachers, both from inside and outside, who would come there and do service. Besides that, in order to secure the attendance of some one all the time, in cases of christening or of death, I have appointed two theological students to come there and do those duties for their board simply.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Without pay?—A. Without pay, except their board.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What is the cost of their board?—A. At first I paid them \$25 per month instead of \$100, but finally I found that they would do it for nothing but their board simply. Their board can not cost over \$6 a month.

Q. So that by that arrangement you save \$94 to the government on the score of chaplains, or more, per month?—A. Yes, sir; \$102 a month.

Q. Are there any other employés of the hospital who are medical students and who receive their board?—A. At different times I have assigned to duty as assistants in the wards, in the dispensary, and in the carpenter-shop, certain medical students who perform those duties, and gave them their board for the duties they performed.

Q. Were those services paid for before your time?—A. They were in part paid for before my time. Medical students have been assigned to duties in the wards as doing expert nursing from the beginning of the hospital, I think; certainly seven or eight years.

Q. That custom you find for the benefit of the institution?—A. Yes, sir; for the benefit of the patients.

Q. Are these things done for the benefit of the hospital or for the benefit of the school?—A. They are done for the benefit of the patients.

Q. And you find they do have that result?—A. They do have that result. The patients are better cared for.

Q. Can you find any cheaper method of having the nurses, the carpenter, &c., than working merely for their board?—A. No, sir; it is a saving to the government.

Q. Does the custom exist in other hospitals?—A. I think it does; I know it does.

Q. Would it cost the government more money to do it in the other way?—A. Yes, sir.

Dr. CHARLES B. PURVIS sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you an officer of the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been connected with it?—A. Nearly thirteen years. It will be thirteen years this coming June.

Q. In what capacity?—A. I have been ward physician; or house physician now they term me. Originally I was one of the assisting physicians. I am now ward physician.

Q. Have you been acquainted with the condition of the hospital during all that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been there all the time—every day?—A. Every day in all that time.

Q. Is the general conduct of the hospital any different during the last three months from what it was the two years previous to that?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has there been any particular difference during the last dozen years? If so, state what those differences are.—A. When I originally came to the hospital it was not called "Freedmen's Hospital"; it was called "Contraband Camp." It was then confined chiefly to the admission of contrabands, as they were then called. The diet for them was very different from what it is now. The government used to issue very rough diet. As a sample illustration, the coffee used to be rye coffee; but after it was transferred to the Freedmen's Bureau, then it was under the control of the medical Director of the District, Director Abbott, now dead. After it came under the control of the Freedmen's Bureau the ration was gradually changed. Even then it was a rather rough ration. I do not think it has been very much changed, however, in the last eight or ten years. It has been pretty much about the same, I think, as now.

Q. How are the provisions at the hospital at the present time?—A. They are excellent. They have always been so for the last eight years.

Q. Are they well cooked?—A. Yes, sir; one of my duties is to examine the dinner, which I do every day, seldom missing a day. As a rule, I do it every day. I examine the food, all of it, and it is all well cooked; and if I find anything that does not meet my approval, I call the attention of the steward to it immediately.

Q. Are the same cooks there now that there have been heretofore?—A. Yes, sir; and one additional cook. Dr. Palmer employed an additional cook to devote herself to the cooking of the extra diet.

Q. What is the food that is given out? We have had a description of the Saturday dinner. Give us a description of some other day—any day.—A. The table varies a little. I do not know that I can recall it now. We have on Fridays a fish dinner. We observe the custom that is observed here among families. We have mackerel; that is for the mess-room. There is a difference between the mess-room diet and the wards. Those in the wards are presumed to be sick; those in the mess-room are presumed to be either convalescent or old people. We have on Fridays a fish dinner. For dinner we have mackerel and potatoes; I think soups; and we have bread pudding or rice pudding for them.

Q. Are the mackerel good?—A. Excellent mackerel.

Q. Do you stint them in the amount of potatoes they shall have?—A. No, sir. Of course, we issue so many pounds to so many patients. I think for the mess-room, seventy pounds of potatoes to one hundred persons. We weigh everything we issue. For breakfast we have cod-fish cooked as well. We have in addition to that corn bread. A great many prefer corn bread. We have corn bread in addition to the baker's bread. The diet that goes to the sick in the wards varies according to the judgment of the physician attending the ward. A great many persons in my wards (and I know it is the same in all the other wards) get egg custards, corn-starch, beef-tea, and all kinds of preserves and fruits. We have peaches and prunes and baked apples occasionally; stewed apples, oatmeal gruel, sometimes the ordinary Indian mush. Then we give steaks to a great many persons; it depends entirely on the person. Some I confine entirely to a milk diet. They have their tea and coffee—coffee for breakfast and tea for supper; some few persons get tea for dinner. That is a special order, however.

Q. Is it any part of your duty to look after the bath-rooms and water-closets?—A. Yes, sir; I inspect them every morning. All my wards are scrubbed every Wednesday and every Saturday. On my beds the sheeting—the linen, as we call it—is changed every Monday. The underwear of the patients is changed every Friday. The patients are washed every Friday; we wash them; that we insist upon. It almost creates a rebellion, but it is done. We do not let a man wash himself; our nurses wash them. We do not wash them in the bath-rooms, however, because they are out from the main ward, and are cold. We have tubs, with screens around the patients, and wash them right alongside the stove. My practice is, the moment a new patient comes in to have him washed immediately, unless it is a person suffering with pneumonia or something that washing would not agree with. He is in only a few minutes when he is washed.

Q. Are the bath-rooms and water-closets kept in as good order as possible?—A. My bath-rooms and water-closets are cleaned every morning, and my nurses have cleaned them as often as two or three times a day. We have some few patients who soil the wards, who cannot retain their water, and we scrub the floor around their beds every day and sometimes oftener. I may say we often change our bed-clothing, sometimes three or four times a day. It depends upon whether a man soils his bed or not.

Q. Is the hospital infected with vermin?—A. No, sir. These water-bugs are vermin, to be sure, but they are harmless creatures. But as to other vermin, such as lice, we have never any. Now and then a patient comes in with some bugs on him, but they are destroyed almost immediately. I do not think they are ever carried from one patient to another. In fact I know it.

Q. Are persons with contagious and loathsome disorders mixed up with other patients?—A. No, sir; we never have any contagious persons admitted to the hospital; but we have men suffering from syphilis, but that is not communicative from one patient to another. They are kept in the wards with the others, scattered about; but that is not an infectious disease from one man to another. Of course, each man has his separate bed, and in such cases they have their separate basins and separate syringes and separate sponges and such things, so that there is no communicating disease from one to another. It never has happened.

Q. Could you not use private rooms in the hospital to take care of those persons and give them separate attendance?—A. That class of patients would not need it any way, and we cannot do it, because it would require more nurses than we can afford to employ. In my ward, however, there is a room attached to the ward where in very bad cases, when somebody was very annoying, we have placed them in that little room and taken convalescent patients to nurse them. That is quite a common thing to do; but, as for a separate room for each one of them, it would be an impossibility. It would require twenty more nurses. All our confinement cases are in private rooms.

Q. Are your consumptive or asthmatic patients where they annoy others?—A. No, sir; they are in the same wards with others; they are scattered about. When a man gets very bad we remove him to the little rooms at the end of the wards. We have not had any asthmatic cases but one. We now and then have one. It is not a very common complaint.

Q. Do the generality of the occupants of the institution seem to be

satisfied with its management?—A. Yes, sir; I think ninety out of a hundred. That is just about the proportion.

Q. Do they make complaints to the physicians—a great proportion of them?—A. I think no patients complained to me about anything prior to the investigation of last fall. Then I found that a great many, who seemed to be put up to it, asked me for clothing, and complained because I would not grant clothing. Some of them would become very impudent, and say, “Congress has appropriated \$3,500 for clothing, and I have a right to have it.” There was an erroneous impression set abroad by those who got up the investigation that every man who once came in there had a right to be clothed up at the government expense; but that appropriation, as we understood it, meant to replace sheets, blanketing, &c., and to buy clothing for the permanent patients—the freedmen who were left as wards of the government. I do issue clothing to a man where he is absolutely needy, but I do not intend to gratify their wishes; I only mean to cover nakedness decently. I could spend the whole appropriation in clothing if I complied with their wishes.

Q. You find this \$3,500 not more than sufficient to carry out the objects of the law as you understood them?—A. Hardly that. We replace bed-clothing.

Q. You keep the patients as decently clothed as you can with the means in your power?—A. Yes, sir. In no other hospitals do they ever clothe patients brought in to be cured. It is not contemplated in any hospital. We aid them. We find a person without shoes or clothes, we give them to him. Our books will show it. Each person's name is recorded and the clothing issued to persons is put down.

Q. Do you know anything about the keeping of cows on the premises there?—A. Yes, sir. A year ago last summer I had a cow which I took for a debt from a man who owed me money. I kept it for a few months. I do not remember now just how many months, but until she became fresh. She had run dry when I got her. Then I sold her. Not a particle of food was ever eaten by the cow at government expense. I bought my feed, some of it in the market and the rest of it around at the feed-stores in the neighborhood. I have the receipts for those purchases. My colleague, Dr. Glennan, keeps his cow, and I have often bought feed for him. In fact we used to buy feed together. Not a morsel of feed did the cows eat at the government expense. They are kept really in a yard that does not belong to the hospital; it belongs to private parties, but they do not use it.

Q. What is the custom with reference to night-nurses to each ward, as compared with those formerly employed?—A. We have the same number of nurses in the ward that I have control of that we ever had. I have one night-nurse who takes charge of my ward and the ward below, and that has been the custom for, I should say, the last five or six years. But when we have very bad cases we detail some of the convalescent patients to assist him. He occasionally has complained about that; but I never thought he was very hard-worked, because there is not a morning that he does not get up and dress himself and go out. When I go into the hospital he is gone, and is away all day. I never found it necessary to employ an additional nurse. I do not think it is yet.

Q. Who was that that complained; the nurse?—A. He has occasionally complained that he wanted more help; but I found that he went out every morning to visit, showing that he was not overworked.

Q. The same number of nurses is kept there that was kept there before?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What is this man's name?—A. His name is William Brown. He is a very good nurse. He has been there nine years.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. He has complained that he had been too much worked?—A. Sometimes, not very lately, a year or so ago. Sometimes the convalescent patient does not respond as quickly as he would like, but no one has ever suffered for want of night nursing.

Q. What is his compensation?—A. I think he gets \$12 or \$15 a month. He has one defective hand. He does not attend the fires. He may put coal on them. He has no cleaning of the wards. All he has to do is to watch patients.

Q. How many nurses are there in all the wards? Is there a nurse to each ward?—A. Yes. We have the day nurses, who do all the cleaning, two for each ward. We have five nurses for these two wards that I speak of. I do not know the exact number altogether. In the female wards we have the same number.

Q. Are those day or night nurses?—A. We have two day nurses to each sick ward and one night nurse for two wards. We have four sick wards with two day nurses, and then we have one night nurse.

Q. To each ward?—A. No, sir; in the two wards. We have one night nurse to two wards. In the female wards we have really two night nurses to the sick ward, one on duty all the time, and then she has an assistant whom she calls upon in case of emergency.

Q. Now let me understand that distinctly. It is alleged that a night nurse was formerly employed for each ward, and that now one man is compelled, through the night, to take charge of two wards containing at least sixty patients.—A. There has been no change in the wards. The wards are the same now as under Dr. Reyburn.

Q. But there is one man to take charge of two wards?—A. During the night; but he has assistance from patients detailed by the doctor in charge.

Q. Are these night nurses and their assistants on hand to attend to any one who is suffering at night?—A. Always.

Q. Is there any danger of a person dying in darkness and gloom without care?—A. We keep gas-light all night in all the wards. We have several burners in the early part of the evening, so that those who read can do so. At 8 o'clock we turn the gas down, but leave one or two burners burning the entire night.

Q. If a person dies during the night is he hustled out of the ward to the dead-house as soon as the vital spark is extinguished?—A. No. A handkerchief is generally tied around his jaws and his clothes are put on him and he is carried out by the night nurse and the watchman. We do not allow them to lie in the ward longer than we can help, on account of the other patients.

Q. Do you know anything about the purchases, whether they are made by contract?—A. I know something about them. The meat is by contract. The other purchases are all from wholesale merchants in the city.

Q. What is the mode of advertising; through the newspapers, or by personal notice to responsible dealers?—A. The doctors will meet. I have carried notices around myself. Several times we took notices around to several butchers to let them put in their bids. That is the custom observed in the Soldiers' Home and the Reform School and by the officers of the Army. We observe the same custom. We do not

advertise. We go around among quite a number of butchers, and they all bring in their bids.

Q. Do you do the same thing in regard to feed, &c.?—A. No, sir; we buy our flour and groceries from wholesale merchants.

Q. By competition among them?—A. We buy from more than one. There is some competition. They always mark down the lowest wholesale prices. We buy at wholesale prices.

Q. Your judgment and knowledge of the institution is that they get articles at low market-prices?—A. I think honestly we get the things lower than if bids were put in, because we keep up the system of competition.

Q. Is it your observation and experience from years in the hospital, and especially of late years, that the articles bought are good?—A. Yes, sir; I have no hesitancy in saying that.

Q. Is there any motive or inducement to anybody to have poor articles?—A. None in the least.

Q. Do you handle any of the money yourself?—A. Not a farthing except a small sum.

Q. What is your pay?—A. Fourteen hundred dollars. It used to be \$2,100 until last July.

Q. Do you receive any pay from the Howard University?—A. No, sir.

Q. You and Dr. Palmer, I believe, are both professors in that university?—A. Yes, sir. The government has nothing to do with that.

Q. You give that service there gratuitously?—A. Yes, sir; they used to pay us, but not now.

Q. In one of the papers laid before us, relating to a different subject, it is said that it is impossible for a doctor to do anything from humane motives or from a desire for the good of mankind, and that he must have some selfish motive. "The surgeons are not so interested and philanthropic as to professionally treat poor, friendless, uninfluential invalids without pecuniary reward." Do you give your services gratuitously to this school in teaching?—A. I was employed at a thousand dollars a year; but when the institution became embarrassed, I did not resign as some professors did, but I continued along lecturing for them. A resolution passed the board of trustees saying that we should be paid if the money could be raised by special endowment, but the philanthropist has not come along to endow us; and all these other professors who have joined us since do not get any pay. We turn over to them the little matriculation-fee, which amounts to less than \$100 each.

Q. Neither you nor Doctor Palmer receive any portion of the matriculation fee?—A. We do not take it. That is optional with us, of course; but we do some charitable work. I have attended an orphan asylum eight or ten years for nothing.

Q. Prescribing for the poor and needy?—A. Yes, sir; it takes a great deal of my time. Then there is an asylum which we have attended for eight or ten years without receiving compensation.

Q. Is it uncommon for the profession to give their services to the poor sick and needy?—A. All doctors do that. The fact is, all the poor of this city are attended to gratuitously. There are no ward physicians here any more, and there is no other way to attend to them. They have abolished the ward physicians, and all the poor are attended by the physicians of the city without pay.

Q. Tell how the medicines are purchased for the hospital?—A. Doctor Palmer buys them from the wholesale dealers here. We make a great many of our medicines, and save money in that way. All our tinctures

we make. We could buy them, of course; but we buy the crude medicines to make them.

Q. I believe you have nothing to do with the expenditures of money?—
A. Nothing whatever.

A. No responsibility in any way?—A. No.

Q. Is it your judgment, being disinterested in that matter, that the appropriation made by Congress is economically and usefully employed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could that appropriation be reduced and the hospital be kept to this degree of usefulness with a decreased appropriation?—A. No, sir; I think the appropriation ought to be increased. It requires a great deal of care to meet the monthly expenses; and as it is itemized, if it was carried out strictly the usefulness of the hospital would have been destroyed. It only allows \$1,800 for nurses and cooks, and I think the amount expended is about \$4,500. We pay them out of the miscellaneous fund as laborers, &c.

Q. You say you have nothing to do with purchasing and making contracts or handling money?—A. Nothing whatever.

Q. You are one of the medical staff or managers of the institution?—
A. Yes, sir.

Q. Dr. Palmer is the one who manages the financial business?—A. He is in control of the finances of the institution.

Q. Have you been raised "from limited means to affluence" by means of your connection with the institution?—A. No, sir; not there. I must confess that I adopted the rule when I first entered the Army as a contract-surgeon to husband all I could out of my salary, and I have done it and have accumulated something.

Q. You have not "fattened on the spoils" of the institution?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know whether Dr. Palmer has grown rich during the last two years since he has been there?—A. He has grown lean, I know, within the last few months. Pecuniarily I am pretty sure he has not grown rich. He has property, a house, I know that he built before he took possession of the hospital.

Q. Has he built no other since?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have the persons of unsound mind, idiots and blind persons, and the able-bodied persons who are there now, if there are any of that class, been there for some years together?—A. From eight to ten.

Q. Has there been any increase of that class?—A. Rather a decrease; one or two have died.

Q. Do able-bodied paupers come there to reside permanently?—A. No, sir. There have been some few kept there, but we only admit the sick.

Q. And they remain, sometimes, after they are cured?—A. There have been some kept there.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What is the method of discharging patients from the hospital; what is the process? Who attends to that?—A. The doctor in care of the wards, as a rule. Sometimes he finds a patient well enough to go out; he gives him a day or two days' notice that he will discharge him. He takes down his card and marks him "discharged."

Q. What is the probable average duration of time patients are kept there?—A. I do not know that I can answer that, as many cases are consumptives who stay a good while. We have never made an average. We have the average number of days' treatment of each individual. I

am not prepared to answer your question. They stay, as a rule, a long while. There are a great many consumptive cases.

Q. Are all persons who apply admitted, or are a great many rejected?—A. Quite a number are rejected; we reject every day. All those who come with an order directly from the Secretary of the Interior we admit; we honor the order; but where a person comes to the hospital, if he is not very sick, we do not think of admitting him. If he is very sick we do not send him away, but we take him in and write a letter to the Secretary stating what is his ailment, and that, in our judgment, he should be admitted to this hospital; and he sends an order accordingly.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Are the lunatics and idiots in charge of nurses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same as other patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they fed like other patients, from the same food?—A. Just the same; no difference is made.

Q. Is as much care taken of their clothing as of that of other patients?—A. They are destructive; they require more care than other patients.

Q. Do they tear their clothes?—A. They are very destructive in that way.

Q. How are their habits?—A. Dirty, filthy, as a rule.

Q. Can that be avoided in any way?—A. No, sir. We have one or two persons who are idiotic from convulsions; "fits," as it is called commonly. They destroy their clothing, and they soil themselves at times. The few insane persons we have are perfectly harmless, however.

Q. Why do you not send these lunatics to the Government Insane Asylum?—A. The authorities there will not receive them because they were not taken insane in the District.

Q. Have you ever attempted to send some of them there?—A. I did send one some four or five years ago. She was over there but a little while and they discharged her. We have her again under our control.

Q. Is there any institution in the District to receive the idiots?—A. No, sir; and none out of the District that I know of that would take these idiots.

Q. Do you know with regard to the employment of students of the university as employes of the hospital?—A. Yes, sir. It has been a custom in the poor-house hospital here to admit resident students. There has been a custom in this institution for eight or ten years to have students connected with it as resident students. We assign them to various duties, to go around the wards with the physicians to attend upon the sick. We used to have them write up cases, keep records. Formerly they used to assist in the commissary, but we do not have them doing that kind of work now. We confine their work now entirely to attending the sick.

Q. How many of them are there altogether now—I mean who are also connected with the Howard University?—A. We have two students who go around the wards, but they do not board in the institution. There are two theological students. Then there are two others who work there; one is a carpenter, and the other works in the dispensary. While he is a student he is employed there as a laborer. We have really but one student working his way for his board outside of the theological students.

Q. Including the theological students are there three?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Three who receive their board for their services?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As chaplains and carpenter?—A. That is all; two chaplains and

one carpenter. The other student is there as a laborer. He is employed, and he happens to be studying medicine at the same time.

Q. What are the duties of a chaplain—to give religious consolation to the dying, and preach, &c.?—A. They hold services on Sabbath morning and during the middle of the week. Then they go through the wards and visit the sick, talk to them, and write their letters for them; those who cannot write they write for, especially many old ladies.

Q. Are the services of these persons necessary?—A. Yes, sir. There has always been a chaplain connected with the institution.

Q. Do you know what the cost of the chaplain was before Dr. Palmer took charge?—A. The one employed just before Dr. Palmer came in there received \$100 a month, quarters for himself and wife, and stabled his horse there. After that, Dr. Palmer employed a young man at \$25 a month, and after that another one at \$12. These present men do not get anything.

Q. Did those who received \$25 and \$12 also get their board?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And these men simply get their board?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Is the religious instruction as efficient now as before?—A. When we paid \$100 a month we did not get very much religious service out of the chaplain—very seldom. Occasionally he would visit the wards, but then it required an order to send him there. That was one reason we got rid of him. Then, he was an Episcopalian, and most of the people in there are generally Methodists and Baptists and a few Catholics. I do not think there are any Episcopalians there; I do not think there is one. There are none to my knowledge. There are a number of Catholics, and their priest comes to see them quite frequently—every week in fact.

Dr. PATRICK GLENNAN sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you connected with the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer. I am.

Q. In what capacity?—A. I am a surgeon, in charge of the dispensary, at present.

Q. How long have you been connected with it?—A. Ever since 1865.

Q. In that capacity?—A. No, sir; for a short time I was in charge of the hospital, and afterwards I was executive officer for a long time.

Q. Do you have anything to do with the management of the finances of the institution?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have no responsibility in that particular, and no interest?—A. None at all. I write a great many orders for supplies. My duties are clerical in that respect, entirely, but I know all about it, however.

Q. In your observation of the purchases for the institution, both of the prices paid and the articles received, are the finances well and economically managed?—A. I think they are.

Q. Do they get good articles?—A. Yes; as good as most families get for their own use.

Q. Have you observed the meats that are brought into the institution; the hominy, the flour, and other articles?—A. Yes, sir; they are all good—good enough for any family, in fact.

Q. How is the cooking?—A. I think the cooking is good. It is very rare that anything is not properly cooked.

Q. How long have the present cooks been there?—A. Some of them have been there at least eight or ten years. There was one cook employed last summer as an extra cook; she has been there only about six months, but the rest have been there for years.

Q. Is this extra cook head cook or assistant?—A. She has special duties—cooking special diet.

Q. Under the prescription of the doctors?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the cooking now, and has it been for the last two months, of the same character that it has been for the last three or four years?—A. Just the same. I do not know of any difference. The same cooks have been employed, and there has been supervision over them. They are looked after pretty sharply, in fact, and always have been.

Q. How is it about the cleanliness of the hospital; what precautions are taken to keep cleanliness?—A. The wards are generally cleaned about two or three times a week, and very frequently parts of the wards are cleaned every day. The bath-rooms are cleaned every morning regularly, and so are the water-closets; and afterwards, if they become soiled during the day, they are cleaned up. Sometimes it occurs every day in some part of the hospital. That is a matter constantly looked after by those in charge of the wards.

Q. Is the hospital infested with vermin?—A. It is not. There are a few water-bugs, but even they are not very numerous. In regard to lice, occasionally some patient will come in lousy, and occasionally some old man will be allowed to stay with his people two or three nights, and he will come back sometimes with vermin; but the nurses are on the lookout for that all the time, and it is very rarely that they get any. If they are discovered on the beds or blankets the articles are turned in immediately and subjected to the steaming process, which prevents any spread. I think, considering the class of people they have there, there is very little of that trouble.

Q. Does Dr. Palmer give much of his time to the institution?—A. Yes, sir; he is there every day, and sometimes at night. Of course when there is any case in the wards requiring attention at night, he is there at night, as we all are sometimes.

Q. Does he seem to be kind to the patients—careful for their health?—A. Very much so, indeed.

Q. Does he seem to personally look after their comfort?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What seems to be the condition of contentment on the part of the inmates as a rule?—A. They are generally contented. It is only a few parties who are not, and they are all in the same ward as a general thing.

Q. Are those persons white or colored who are discontented?—A. Both; some white and some colored.

Q. So far as you know, have any injuries been inflicted on those persons who complain?—A. No, sir; not at all.

Q. Do they receive the same food as others and the same care?—A. The same food; in fact they are rather better off on account of their importunities. They get just as much care and are treated kindly, I know.

Q. Were they treated kindly before the complaints were made?—A. They were. I believe everything was done for them that was possible.

Q. Can you name some of those who complain?—A. Felton, Johnson, and Potter, and two or three parties who are now away from the hospital—Clagett, Dorsey, and Stewart. I think there were not over a dozen of them altogether. Two-thirds of them are in the ward where Felton and Johnson are. I do not think over a dozen in the whole.

Q. Is Felton a white man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his disease?—A. Paralysis of the lower extremities. He is in Dr. Purvis's ward. He was in my ward at first, and was sent out of it for reasons.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How long has Felton been in the hospital?—A. He came in last April, I think.

Q. Is he resident of the District?—A. I think not. He came into the District a year or two ago and brought up in Providence Hospital, as I understand, but I cannot say about his residence.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What compensation do you receive at the hospital?—A. One hundred dollars a month.

Q. How much did you formerly receive?—A. I received \$2,100 formerly; that was for a few years.

Q. Under the present management the expenses are cut down to the lowest notch?—A. They are.

Q. Instead of expending the money in high salaries the money is spent in furnishing clothing, food, and proper attendance?—A. That is precisely the case. It is very carefully done.

SATURDAY, *February 9, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the Freedmen's Hospital at 10 o'clock a. m.

Dr. G. S. PALMER recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are there any dissections carried on in the hospital?—Answer. No, sir; none in the hospital at all.

Q. Are any ever carried on in sight of the patients?—A. Never; that has never been done.

Q. It has been published in the newspapers that that was the practice, and that it had been done. Is there any foundation for it?—A. No foundation for it at all.

Q. Is there no instance in which dissecting has been done in the presence of patients?—A. There is no instance in which dissecting has been done in the presence of anybody except those medical students who were properly present, and the room was properly guarded and protected. I do not think it could possibly have been done without my knowledge. I know nothing of it, and I do not believe there is any chance for anything of that kind ever to have occurred.

Q. Do you know of any witness who testified that that was the case? If so, give us his name.—A. I do not think of any witness that testified to that. One of the witnesses testified with regard to seeing some parts of what he supposed to be flesh that were in the attic. That was the engineer. He testified that he saw some flesh in the attic.

Q. The attic of what?—A. Of this building.

Q. Is that any part of the hospital premises?—A. No, sir; it is the attic which is over the whole. The upper two stories belong to the medical college; the lower two stories to the hospital.

Q. This was on the premises of the medical college?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know about the fact of that flesh being there?—A. I know

nothing of it at all, and never heard of it until the engineer testified to it. There was a complaint made that some things were being done improperly there—I cannot remember exactly what—but there was something that led me to order a lock and key to be put on the door, and the key was given to the engineer to take charge of—the scuttle going up into the attic, so that nobody could get up there.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Why give the key to the engineer?—A. The engineer has to go there to work the water-tank.

Q. When was that?—A. That was one or two years ago.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. I am informed that it has also been alleged in the newspapers that bodies, after dissection, are crowded into sacks and buried on the hospital premises. How is that?—A. That is not true. A short time ago complaint was made to the police that there were bones or parts of bodies buried here, and a sensational letter was written stating that the thing needed investigation, and they notified the chief of police, I suppose. I found the coroner and health-officer and the lieutenant of police here one afternoon to investigate the matter. I told them to go on and investigate; if there was anything it was unknown to me. They went to the party who gave the information, who was Felton, and he called in other parties who knew where some bones had been buried, and they proceeded to take them up, and found that they were some bones which medical students had placed there for the purpose of maceration. The health-officer examined the premises and said there was nothing dangerous to health at all, or that was improper, and he had nothing to do with it. The coroner examined into it and said that he discovered no indication of anything wrong, and he made his report to that effect. He said the students should turn the bones over to me, and told me they had no control over them whatever, but if they belonged to the students, they had better take care of them.

Q. What bones were these?—A. They were some bones that probably came from the dissections of the year before. They had lain the best part of a year.

Q. How numerous were they?—A. They were small portions of the different bones of the system.

Q. How many pounds? Give us an idea of the amount.—A. There was part of a thorax and head in one place and part of a leg in another, as near as I can recollect: a part of an arm in another. I should say that would cover the whole thing. I cannot say definitely as to that.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. What were they placed there for?—A. Maceration; that is, for the little remaining flesh on them to decay, and then they wanted to take them up and preserve them.

Q. Is that customary?—A. Customary among students.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You do not bury the dead on the premises?—A. Never.

Q. What is the form of burying?—A. The form of burying is to get a certificate when a person dies and send the certificate to the board of health, and the board of health gives a permit for him or her to be buried in Potter's Field. Then the body is buried in Potter's Field. That is the general rule; but the Catholics bury their own dead; and

sometimes friends come and get the patients' bodies and bury them as they choose.

Q. Have you a copy of the charges filed against you in the Interior Department?—A. I have.

Q. Please hand them to the committee.—A. These are the charges :

WASHINGTON, August 25, 1877.

SIR : I hereby charge Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, in the city of Washington, with dereliction of duty and official malfeasance ; with culpable disregard for the safety, comfort, and welfare of the patients in that institution ; with maladministration of its pecuniary affairs, whereby the public money appropriated for the maintenance and support of said hospital has been, to a large extent, perverted, wasted, embezzled, or abstracted ; with wrongfully using or permitting others to use public property in his official custody for the benefit of private parties, and with being disqualified to hold the position and exercise the functions of surgeon-in-chief of said Freedmen's Hospital.

SPECIFICATIONS.

First. In that said Palmer provides the patients in said hospital revolting food, measured out to each in quantity insufficient to satisfy hunger. The provender is execrably cooked, and especially unfit for invalids, whose condition requires good, palatable, and nutritious food. Beeves' heads and legs, oftentimes putrid, chopped up and concocted into odious messes ; pickled pork and beef, saturated in brine from time immemorial, till it becomes semi-petrified and rusty ; ancient mackerel, corroded with salt and nauseating in smell ; sour bread and musty hominy ; a solitary potato in its jacket, about the size of a hen's egg, allotted each patient at dinner ; and insipid slops, nominated coffee and tea, constitute, in substance, the regular diet of the institution ; and the meals served in the mess-room do not actually cost more than seven cents per day for each patient. Superannuated, slovenly, and unskillful persons are employed as cooks, at four dollars per month for the services of each, and such culinary botches could not fail to spoil the best of viands if intrusted to them to prepare for the table ; but with inferior provisions, such as said Palmer supplies, they produce detestable messes that are not fit for any human being to eat.

Second. In that, under said Palmer's management, the bath-room and water-closets attached to the male wards of said hospital are kept in an offensive condition. Slops are emptied therein, and filthy utensils used by the sick are washed in the bath-tub in which the patients of the respective wards bathe, whereby they are exposed to imminent danger of contracting terrible diseases, and malaria is liable to be generated by the foul odors and decomposing matter therein that poison the atmosphere.

Third. In that, under said Palmer's management, the furniture, fixtures, and utensils in the wards are dilapidated, uncomfortable, mean, and unsuited for service ; that the bedsteads, beds, pillows, sheets, blankets, spreads, chairs, tables, and other articles were transferred to said hospital by the government or sanitary commission when the Army hospitals were abandoned at the close of the late war, and have been in constant service and received severe usage for more than ten years ; that the beds, bedding, and wainscots of the walls are infested with multitudinous and repulsive vermin of various kinds, and no proper effort is made to destroy them ; and that the entire furniture and equipments of any one ward would not sell for the sum of one hundred dollars.

Fourth. In that, under said Palmer's management, patients afflicted with contagious, infectious, and loathsome disorders are commingled promiscuously in the wards with the other patients, who are thus exposed to the dangers of contracting terrible maladies, whereas the patients so afflicted should be classified and congregated in private rooms, of which there is an abundance in said hospital, and thus be isolated from the other patients, who would be secured immunity from harm from that source.

Fifth. In that, through said Palmer's remissness, consumptive and asthmatic patients are quartered in the wards among the other patients, who are thus compelled to breathe an atmosphere contaminated with the exhalations from diseased lungs, and are deprived of their sleep and disturbed in their rest at night by incessant and painful coughing, hawking, and expectorating, which, in pulmonary complaints, are infinitely worse in the night-time than during the day, whereas such obnoxious patients could readily be isolated from the others by assigning them to private rooms, which, with a reckless disregard for the health and comfort of the patients, are permitted to be occupied by employes of the institution or by persons that are comparatively well.

Sixth. In that said Palmer has allowed private persons to keep three cows on the hospital premises at the government expense, while he purchased from outside parties all the milk required for the use of the institution, yet the same number of cows belonging to the hospital could have been kept at the same cost, and supplied the hospital with pure milk, whereby the government would have saved the large milk-bills that have been paid for that institution needlessly.

Seventh. Said Palmer permits the Howard University and the Howard mansion to be constantly supplied with water at the government expense; the tank on each of these buildings is daily filled with water pumped by the government engineer at said hospital, who runs the government engine for that purpose with government fuel at estimate cost of \$5 per day, and the sum of \$1,800 of public money is thus misused annually, to which extent the appropriation to said hospital is diminished. Such conversion of public property to private use is a grave offense that demands punishment of the offender and restitution to the government.

Eighth. Said Palmer has done grievous harm to the inmates of said hospital by abrogating the custom of employing a night-nurse for each ward, but compelling one man during the night to take charge of two wards, containing at least sixty patients, and also attend to four fires in cold weather, which onerous duties cannot be properly discharged by a single individual. Hence patients in severe cases suffer intensely from neglect and disturb the other patients by their cries for succor and relief, while the *dying are abandoned to their fate, and suffered to expire in darkness and gloom*, without care, solace, or sympathy, and are hustled out of the ward to the dead-house as soon as the vital spark is extinguished.

Ninth. In that, under said Palmer's management, goods, wares, and merchandise required for said hospital have not been purchased, as far as practicable, on contracts awarded to lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement, as is the custom with the War and Navy Departments, and in every well-regulated government institution, but have, to a great extent, been procured from retail dealers in small quantities from time to time, as the immediate exigency demanded, whereby articles of inferior quality were obtained at high prices, the public money was squandered, and the hospital failed to receive the full benefit of the appropriation granted it by Congress.

Tenth. The legitimate expenses of said hospital, as conducted under its present management, do not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars per annum, and all money beyond that sum drawn out of the Treasury on its account has been misused, squandered, embezzled, or purloined. Through such perversion or abstraction of appropriated funds the government is alleged to have been plundered and the hospital defrauded to the amount of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars during the past five years; while the members of the *medical staff, managers of the institution, have been raised from limited means to affluence, become the owners of valuable real estate, and fare sumptuously every day at the expense of the poor and the sick, the maimed and the dying, for whom Congress made liberal provision*. If the public bounty had been honestly and judiciously administered for the sole benefit and behoof of the beneficiaries and not for the individual profit and aggrandizement of the functionaries to whom the execution of the trust was confided.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

ADDITIONAL SPECIFICATIONS.

Eleventh. Under said Palmer's management, lunatics, idiots, blind persons, and able-bodied paupers are permanent inmates of said hospital, instead of being consigned to the institutions specially established for the reception of such unfortunates.

Said hospital is a sanitary institution, created solely for the accommodation, care, and treatment of invalids, and the presence of these intruders among the patients is detrimental, repugnant, and dangerous to them. These individuals, moreover, occupy much room in the wards, which ought to be appropriated to such persons as require medical or surgical treatment, many of whom are crowded out of said hospital by these objectionable inmates; the expense of supporting these creatures is a misuse of the money appropriated for the maintenance of said hospital, and the patients, to that extent, are deprived of their rights and property. The lunatics and idiots are not treated as patients in charge of nurses, but are consigned to the custody of keepers, who frequently beat them and reduce them to subjection by fear and violence. They are clothed in rags, are filthy in their habits, and subsist on refuse and slops. These obnoxious persons are alleged to be domiciled in said hospital for the purpose of augmenting the total number of inmates in order that the maintenance of said hospital may plausibly be represented as costing more than is actually expended for its support.

Twelfth. Since the commencement of the fiscal year on the 1st day of July, 1877, three surgeons have been officially connected with said hospital, notwithstanding the appropriation act makes provision for the employment of two surgeons only for the current year; if these three surgeons have received compensation for their services at said hospital since July 1, 1877, the payment to one of them was unauthorized and illegal, the public money, to that extent, was misused for that purpose, and the money appropriated to said hospital was squandered to the amount of such disbursement.

If, however, one of said surgeons continued his professional connection with said hospital and treated its patients without receiving any salary or compensation from the appropriation, it is palpable that he derives a profit out of the institution equivalent in value to his

services, inasmuch as these surgeons are not so disinterested and philanthropic as to professionally treat poor, friendless, uninfluential invalids without pecuniary reward. Either circumstance evinces official malfeasance, unscrupulous greed, and flagrant betrayal of a sacred trust in the management of said hospital and its executive officers.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

I hereby certify that this is a true copy of original charges and specifications presented by Mr. Johnson.

T. B. HOOD,
Chairman Committee of Investigation.

OCTOBER 9, 1877.

Q. Did you make any reply to the charges, any written answer?—A. I did. I submitted the following reply, and after being, as I understood, acquitted by the committee appointed by the Secretary, I sent a still further defense.

The following is the reply :

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1878.

To the Hon. Committee Investigating Charges against the Management of the Freedmen's Hospital:

GENTLEMEN: I took charge of this hospital as surgeon-in-chief March 20, 1875. I received for all the property in the hospital, and am personally responsible for every article within or on the premises. On taking charge I went to the Hon. Secretary of the Interior for instructions and advice, and received the following only: "You must do the best you can with the establishment, but be sure and never exceed your appropriation." I learned that the management of the hospital for the few previous years had been generally acceptable, and I adopted and continued the customs and practices, so far as they seemed to me to be right, as my guide of action, and corrected those which seemed to me to be wrong. I endeavored to put the hospital into a condition to do the most good to the largest number, and I have continued that principle of action ever since.

The history of this hospital shows that it was established by the Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau, and managed by him till July 1, 1872, when it passed into the care of the Secretary of War, and was under the direct management of the Surgeon-General till July 1, 1874, when it was transferred to the Department of the Interior. The hospital was first established for the support and medical and surgical treatment and care of about 250 or 300 sick, decrepit, aged, blind, idiotic, crazy, poor colored persons, "freed people," who had been collected together in this District by the Freedmen's Bureau and the General Government from the breaking up of numerous hospitals and contraband camps. A large number of these original patients are now in this hospital. Congress at one time evidently intended to admit no new patients, and guarded its appropriation with a clause providing that no new patients should be admitted.

The pressure, however, for the admission to the hospital of the sick and disabled poor was so great and their necessities so urgent that they were admitted, and after a while, by the efforts of philanthropists, the prohibitory clause was left out of the bill making the appropriation. Since this time sick and disabled persons, regardless of color, sex, or birth, who were destitute and *absolutely* unable to take care of themselves, have been admitted to the hospital on the order of the Surgeon-General or the Secretary of the Interior. The governor of the District also at one time sent all the sick paupers of the city and county here for treatment and support, by an arrangement made with the Surgeon-General, as I understand.

As to clothing, it has been held and the practice has been that the original patients only should receive clothing, except in cases of absolute necessity. Should all the requests of patients for clothing be complied with it would exhaust half the appropriation. It is not customary for hospitals to furnish clothing for their patients. In spite of all our care a large amount of clothing is worn away accidentally or carried away intentionally every year.

When I came to the hospital I found a large number of the employés of the institution receiving pay at a fixed price on the pay-roll, and receiving in addition thereto rations of provisions amounting to from six dollars to thirty dollars per month. I discontinued these rations and established rates of pay as the services seemed to me worth, and I required the employés generally to board at the hospital. This arrangement was acquiesced in pleasantly by the employés at the time, but recently they seem to have discovered that they were very much abused by having their rations withheld from them.

I found a chaplain receiving a hundred dollars per month salary, with fuel, room, and lights for himself and family. His services were merely nominal, as most of the religious exercises were conducted by volunteer preachers from within and without the hospital. He was discharged, and an active, energetic licentiate was employed who did much better service for twenty-five dollars per month and board. Also a musician, who received one hundred

dollars salary per annum, was discharged. Chaplain services are now well performed by two theological students for their board.

I dismissed the assistant engineer as soon as I found his services could be dispensed with. He was receiving twenty-five dollars per month and board.

I have purchased the meats principally by contract. I have purchased the groceries from two wholesale and retail grocers at a time, so that one might compete with the other, and thus enable me to get the articles at the lowest cash price. I have also kept strict watch of the markets and know that my purchases have all been well made.

I have assigned to duty from time to time in the dispensary, in the wards, and in the carpenter-shop, medical students, who have received only their board as compensation for their services. This I found had been an established custom in this hospital, and it also exists in other well-regulated hospitals. The labor performed by these students would have cost the government more money if performed by paid employes than the cost of the board of the students.

1st. I have employed the same cooks, nurses, and employes generally, whom I found at the hospital, and whose services had heretofore been acceptable to the patients and to the employes. I have provided a good quality of food in every respect and a sufficient quantity, and I have had it well cooked and well served.

2d. I have kept the hospital as clean and well ventilated and warmed in all respects as the nature of the diseases treated and the character of the patients would permit. The wards are swept every day, they are scrubbed twice a week, and parts of them every day, the water-closets are cleaned every day; all of which has been done daily and weekly for eight years at least.

3d. I have supplied the best furniture, bedding, and clothing which the money appropriated would permit. When articles are worn too much for use new ones are provided.

4th. I have never allowed patients affected with infectious or contagious diseases to be placed in such contiguity with other patients as would admit of communicating their diseases. No contagious diseases are allowed in the hospital.

5th. I have arranged the patients and utilized the rooms of the hospital in the best manner possible consistent with the number of nurses and attendants allowed by the amount of money appropriated.

6th. No cows belonging to private persons have been kept on the hospital premises, at the government expense, or to the injury of the hospital.

7th. The lease of the hospital property by the government contains stipulations requiring the government to supply the Howard University with water daily, also to warm and light the parts of the main building reserved in the lease for the use of the medical school. The expense of pumping the water and for fuel and lights for medical department amounts to less than \$200 per annum.

8th. I have not abrogated the custom of employing a night-nurse for each ward, but have continued the same nurses whom I found here, and I have insisted that convalescent patients, who were able, should assist the nurses in taking care of the wards, which practice exists in all free hospitals.

9th. All articles purchased for this hospital have been of good quality, and have been procured at the lowest cash price, mostly at wholesale and contract prices.

10th. I have not plundered the government of \$15,000, nor any part of it; nor have I defrauded the hospital of that sum, nor any part of that sum. I have not misused, embezzled, perverted, or abstracted one single cent of the government's money, but on the other hand I have striven anxiously and earnestly to expend the money appropriated in the most prudent and economical manner. I have never, since my connection with this institution, had in my possession one dollar of money belonging to the government with the exception of \$29.70, for which I have the government's receipt. All the business for the hospital has been done by checks, receipts, warrants, and vouchers, all of which are matters of record and can be traced; and I court and challenge the most careful, rigid, and scrutinizing examination of the same. They are all right to a cent.

11th. It is stated as a specific charge that certain lunatics, idiots, blind persons, and able-bodied paupers are permanent inmates of this hospital, contrary to law and to the comfort of other patients. In reply to this I have simply to say that this hospital was established and has been continued for the express purpose of taking care of these identical persons. There is no other place for them, and it would not only be inhuman to turn them out but it would be a forced and unjust construction of the intention of the appropriation of Congress to treat them otherwise than they are treated here. They are cared for humanely, and in such manner as is for the best interest of themselves and all the other inmates.

12th. Since the first day of July, 1877, two surgeons have been employed in this hospital and paid according to the conditions of the bill making appropriation for the support of the hospital for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1877. One other assistant surgeon, whose services are necessary, has been employed and paid from the reserved or hospital fund belonging to this hospital. The uncommonly large amount set apart for miscellaneous expenses in the bill for the support of the hospital for the present year was intended to meet this case, as I was informed by the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriation, but the law defining the manner in which miscellaneous funds may be expended prevented its applica-

tion to the payment of a second assistant surgeon. I accordingly approved of his payment from the hospital reserved fund.

Supplementary, first. No rooms in or on the premises of this hospital, not reserved in the lease of the property from the Howard University, have been used for the use of this medical department of that institution, and no such rooms have been lighted or heated except in accordance with the conditions of the lease of the property.

Secondly. No furniture, fixtures, goods, or chattels belonging to the hospital have been used for the benefit of the medical college or the students thereof.

Third. Medical students have been assigned to duty by the respondent in the dispensary, the wards, and the carpenter-shop, in this hospital, from time to time, and in consideration of such services they have had their board furnished them by the hospital; and the board of the students has been no better than the board of the nurses and other employés; indeed they have eaten at the same table, but sometimes at separate hours for convenience. Nothing extra has ever been purchased for them, nor have they ever to my knowledge received any extra article for food.

Fourth. The medical school is an institution entirely distinct from the hospital, and as an officer of that school I am prepared to state, and do state, that its affairs have been managed humanely, discreetly, and prudently, and no *débris* from the dissecting-room has ever been buried on the hospital premises to my knowledge, or by my consent, and it is absolutely impossible for the water used in this hospital to be in any way affected by any transaction or operation of the medical school. As to the charge that "Deceased bodies of patients have been surreptitiously removed from the dead-house, &c.," I have to say to my knowledge nothing of this kind has ever occurred. All autopsies and examinations of dead bodies have been decently and properly made under my own or one of my assistant surgeon's direct observation. I have given no order or permit for any body to be removed from the dead-house except to be carried to the proper place of burial.

Fifth. I have received authority from the Department of the Interior, written or verbal, for the sale of all property which has been sold by me, and I have returned every dollar of the proceeds of such sales to that department with accounts of such sales, and I hold receipts for the same.

Respectfully submitted.

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

Q. What was the letter which you wrote bearing on these charges?—

A. This is the letter:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL,
Washington, January 21, 1878.

SIR: In view of your statements and intimations made to me as Surgeon-in-Chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, in two recent interviews, I respectfully request your attention to the following statement:

During the past summer, numerous complaints about the management of the Freedmen's Hospital were lodged with you, which complaints were mostly instigated by parties desirous to obtain control of the patronage and offices of the institution.

You appointed a committee to investigate these charges. That committee, consisting of Drs. Hood, Ewing and Walsh, thoroughly prosecuted the investigation, allowing it on the part of the complaining witness to take the widest possible range. In many instances it covered matters which occurred years before my appointment as surgeon of the hospital. So determined were they to get at the bottom of everything, that they were utterly uncontrolled by the well-known rules of evidence.

These gentlemen spent nearly one month at the hospital. They were brought face to face with the witnesses produced to sustain the charges. They saw the manner in which, and the animus with which, the witnesses testified, many of whom in a single expression of countenance and utterance of a word gave volumes of testimony which could in no way be expressed in any written report. The committee at their pleasure visited all the wards and patients, examined the food, the cooks, the nurses, the store-rooms, all the papers and all the records and books of the hospital in search of truth.

At the same time, during all the examination, the complaining witness and his attorney were present in the hospital night and day, influencing and preparing witnesses, and not a few of the witnesses were made to believe that they must testify in favor of the government, or they would lose their places.

Now I understand from you that this committee have exonerated me, but that you think that the reported testimony does not justify their finding. Is it not just and right that I, having been tried and acquitted by a tribunal of your own appointment, should have afforded me the benefit of that report? You say that I have had the services of excellent counsel. That counsel saw that there was no case against me, and was willing to submit the whole matter without putting in any testimony on my side. Furthermore, I am fully

satisfied that a large amount of valuable testimony has never been reported, and it must be impossible for you to come to a correct judgment without that, or without seeing the witnesses and being personally conversant with the circumstances under which the testimony was taken.

Most of the questions propounded by the attorney for the prosecution were carefully prepared in writing and were leading, all of which were admitted. The answers of the witnesses showed they knew the nature of the questions to be put to them, and their manner of answering was in marked contrast with that shown to the defense, to whom they were at times so violent and unruly as to require the committee to frequently admonish them.

As to the quality of the food bought by me for the institution, I respectfully call your attention to the testimony of the government meat-inspector, Wolf, and to the testimony of Chapman, who was a witness for the prosecution; also to that of the baker, Kaiser, and to Messrs. Galt and Hamilton, who supplied the flour, all of which is in the printed testimony.

I also wish to call your attention to the various improvements that have been made during the time I have had charge of the hospital. When I came here I found an abuse existing in the issuing of rations to those employed. I found some drawing as high as five rations a day, others two and three. As this was not known to the government, I discontinued it, and increased the compensation of some, so that the actual pay would appear upon the rolls. This created considerable feeling against me on the part of several of the nurses and the drivers who were witnesses against me. I improved very much the diet for the sick. The diet in the mess-room has always been as good as I found it; the same diet-table has been followed.

I built what was much needed, an extra diet-kitchen, where the diet for the sick is cooked separately by an extra cook.

I have remodeled water-closets, refloored, reroofed, and repainted and repaired to such extent as the means at my disposal and the circumstances would justify.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the appropriations for the hospital have been annually reduced, so that the present amount is nearly one-half less than it was five years ago. The number of patients in the hospital is about the same.

As to the keeping of resident students I wish to state I continued what had been *established* years before I took charge of the institution. There has never been a time within the last eight years when there has not been students present, all of whom rendered service, the number being limited. The theological students took the place of a chaplain, who was receiving when I came here \$100 per month, and had a room, lights, and fuel provided for himself and family, also stabling for a horse, all of which was discontinued by me. The government has not lost anything by the presence of these students; to the contrary, I think it has been a gainer. Furthermore, allow me to state that out of the (230) patients present when the investigation of this institution commenced, only thirteen of them appeared as witnesses against me, and part of these, by their own admissions, were men addicted to the lowest vices, and some of whom had been discharged from other hospitals in this city for misconduct. Taking this fact, together with the character of those who preferred the charges, and the pressure that has been brought by outsiders, who have spared no means to injure me because I would not allow them to control and farm out the patronage of the hospital, I submit, as an act of justice which one man should always accord to another, am I, who have lived so long with an unblemished character and have had charge during the war of the largest hospitals, to have my reputation blackened by a set of persons *utterly* irresponsible, and who have nothing to lose? As an illustration of the spirit that animates the leaders of the crusade against me, I refer you to the article in the Star of Saturday last, signed by Mr. Felton, who styles himself as "prosecuting attorney" for the government, a man *utterly* bankrupt in reputation and an outcast from his family.

In presenting the additional testimony allowed me, I would respectfully call your attention to the fact that the Freedmen's Hospital is a peculiar institution. Many of its inmates are from the lowest grades of society. They are uncleanly in their habits, rough in their manners, and undisciplined in every respect. Many of them are suffering from the foulest and most loathsome diseases. It requires the greatest amount of care and labor to keep them even decent. Some of them are imbeciles, and are filthy from the very nature of their infirmities. The question should be, whether I have kept these patients and their wards in the highest state of cleanliness which the nature of the case would allow. I contend that I have.

The hospital was put into my hands without any instructions, to manage according to my own best judgment and the precedents which were established by my predecessors. I have followed all the good precedents and have lopped off the bad ones. I have kept steadily in view what I believe the government intended by the appropriation; that is, to confer the largest amount of good upon the greatest number of patients with the smallest amount of money, and not to spend for ornamentation or superfluities one single cent.

I have allowed and courted the fullest investigation. I have honestly, and, as I believe, efficiently, performed my duty.

It is not the position which I hold in this hospital that I care for at all, but it is the man-

ner foreshadowed of leaving it to which I object. I cannot consent to have my character impeached until I have exhausted all the means of defense within my reach.

I would gladly submit my case to a thorough investigation by a committee of Congress.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon in Chief.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ.

Secretary of the Interior, Washington.

WILLIAM W. PATTON sworn and examined.

By Mr. Eaton :

Q. What is your position here?—A. I am the president of the Howard University.

Q. State the connection, if there is any, between the Freedmen's Hospital and the Howard University?—A. The only direct relation that we sustain is that of landlord, so to speak, to the Freedmen's Hospital. We own the grounds and the buildings occupied by the Freedmen's Hospital, which we rent to the government, to be used in that way.

Q. The contract between you and the government is a written lease, is it?—A. It has been. I know this as an officer of the institution, familiar with its affairs. Of course, I have not myself done the business, but I know it from my knowledge of the affairs of the institution, for I have seen the lease that we have ordinarily had. During the last year, until the beginning of the current year, I understand it was allowed to run on without being formally renewed.

Q. Is it your understanding that the government is your tenant under the old written lease?—A. This current year there is no lease. The government made an insufficient appropriation to meet the rent. We declined to make a lease that should be reduced in terms into writing to meet the reduced appropriation, and the government is simply here on sufferance, therefore, on our premises.

Q. Did you so inform the proper officer of the government?—A. Yes, sir; the one that represented the government to us; that is, Dr. Palmer, who was in charge and acted for the government, and had always acted in making out the lease. The lease had been \$4,000 a year rent, together with certain reservations as to the use of part of this building for our medical department, and that had been a written lease. We declined to renew that written lease on the terms offered for the current year by Dr. Palmer; that is, for \$2,000 instead of \$4,000.

Q. The government continues to occupy the premises?—A. The government continues to occupy the premises on sufferance from us. We have accepted the \$2,000, as far as it went, claiming an arrearage of the other half, and waiting for Congress to make an additional appropriation to cover the arrearage of rent. The university owns the steam-engine and everything, in fact, that is here in use by the government, and reserved in renting the premises the right to use this steam-engine one hour per day for the purpose of furnishing water to the university on the hill. We get the tank full, from which the professors houses also are supplied.

Q. That the lease shows?—A. The lease shows that. It is part of the consideration.

Q. That is, the work was to be done with your own engine but at the expense of the government, whatever it might be?—A. Yes. We reserved also the use of certain rooms, that were to be lighted and warmed, for our medical department. The lease shows all the provisions. I have said that this is the only direct relation we have. We

have nothing whatever to do with the management of the hospital in any respect. Indirectly we derive advantages, from the fact that they are contiguous to us, and that our students have been permitted to have access to the hospital in their professional studies; and the same gentleman who has been in charge of the government hospital happens also to be the dean of our medical faculty; and of course that, incidentally, is helpful to us.

Q. If you have had your attention directed to it, I should like to ask you for your opinion as to the value of the property occupied by the hospital, so that we might ourselves arrive at a conclusion as to what would be a fair rent for it. What is the value of the property occupied by the hospital?—A. I can simply say this, that I have been informed, as president, making inquiries myself on the subject, that the buildings cost \$100,000.

Q. The buildings occupied by the hospital?—A. The buildings occupied here on this ground; the hospital buildings and medical buildings occupied by the government cost \$100,000 in round numbers, aside from the value of the ground.

Q. Are you sufficiently acquainted with the value of real estate in this locality to say what, in your judgment, at the present shrinkage of values, would be a fair price for the ground and buildings occupied by the hospital?—A. I should be hardly willing to fix the price without taking time for some thought on the subject, for I could not give you the exact extent of the ground. The eye, of course, takes in quite an extent of ground at once, but just so much ground is occupied, and as they sell in Washington by the square foot, it makes an important element to know somewhat definitely what the ground is worth.

Q. Can you approximate to it?—A. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the extent of ground to quite dare to say.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is a rent of \$4,000 a year a reasonable rent for such premises?—A. We have considered it very cheap. The rent used to be \$5,000.

Q. Do you know of the present Secretary of the Interior having written a letter to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives asking for the additional \$2,000?—A. He told me he would. I have had correspondence with him on this subject in which he recognized the justice of our claim and said he would bring it to the attention of Congress at the present session. I have his statement to that effect in writing, and suppose he has done so, but I have no knowledge of the fact whether he has or not. I should also like to state another point, inasmuch as attention has been called to it in the papers. It has been represented, I have seen in the daily papers here, that Howard University was deriving in some improper way support from this hospital, particularly in the matter of students. It has been represented that the students of Howard University were being virtually supported, as it were, here at the hospital. I should like to say that knowing all our students to be poor and needing help, I have inquired to learn how they received it, and so far as I have been able to learn there have been only five or six students in all receiving help at any one time, part of them medical students, and one or two of them theological students; that the theological students acted as chaplains to this large establishment for their board, which we consider a very cheap thing for the government. Of course the young men in their poverty were glad to get even that much chance to work and support themselves.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Did you say two ?—A. Two in the theological department, part of the time; and one, part of the time. Dr. Palmer, of course, knows more definitely because he made the arrangements, but that is my understanding of the case. There has been either one or two young men usually during the last year or two here from the theological department who acted as chaplains in the institution, and received their board as their pay.

Q. With regard to medical students, how is it ?—A. I have heard, as president making similar inquiries as to what our medical students did for support, that there were three or four medical students who were from time to time here as what are called resident students, giving assistance in the hospital in a sort of professional character, half nurse I suppose and half physician, to assist the doctors in the care of cases that needed particular attention, and they have received their board. I have made some inquiries to learn from physicians if that was customary, and have been informed that it was. But they can speak for themselves.

The subcommittee then proceeded to go through various wards examining witnesses.

WARD NO. I.

MICHAEL BOYLAN (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. How long have you been here ?—Answer. Two weeks last Wednesday.

Q. What is your treatment here at the hospital ?—A. Pretty good.

Q. Do you find the nurses and doctors attentive ?—A. Yes, sir; very much.

Q. What do you have to eat? Is your food wholesome and well cooked ?—A. Very well cooked, and considering that there are so many here it is very good; good doctoring and good treatment indeed.

Q. Is there any further statement you wish to make ?—A. I know of nothing.

CHARLES RALLETTE (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is the number of this ward ?—Answer. No. 1, I think.

Q. How long have you been here ?—A. I believe I came on the 21st of January.

Q. How do you find your treatment here at the hospital ?—A. I find my treatment very well, considering. I have a first-rate physician. He has lifted me up wonderfully since I have been here. I came here in a dying state with most terrific chronic diarrhœa, and he has built me up wonderfully.

Q. Do you find your food and attendance good ?—A. Very good indeed. I do not think there could be any fault found so far as I am concerned.

Q. How about the cleanliness of the beds, the floors, and so forth? Are they kept in good order ?—A. Well, I think under present circumstances that they cannot be done much better. The place wants renovating, of course.

Q. Are the floors always as clean as these seem to be ?—A. Yes;

they work on the floors three or four times a week. They do their duty as far as I have observed. I do not think there is anything left undone.

Q. Do you find the quality of the food good?—A. Well, sir, I have precisely what the doctor orders me for my disease, in good shape it seems to be; and I think, from what I see that, every man is allowed to take what is ordered him.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Do you leave your bed during the day?—A. Very seldom yet.

Q. You do not go to the mess-table?—A. No, sir; I cannot go.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You receive your food by prescription?—A. Yes, sir; it is ordered by the doctor.

JOSEPH GOOD (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been in the hospital?—Answer. Ever since last May.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Do you recollect the day of the month?—A. May 28.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What has been your treatment in the hospital?—A. First-rate; no fault to find since I have been here.

Q. Have you had good food?—A. Yes, sir; good food and the place kept clean.

Q. Do you find that to be the case throughout this ward?—A. Yes, sir; throughout this ward.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Has it been so ever since you have been here, about the same uniformly?—A. Yes, sir; pretty much the same.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Has there been any change during the last three months; that is to say, is it these last three months any different from what it was before?—A. No, sir.

Q. Something has been said in the papers about putrid food being given to the patients. Do you find any such food?—A. None has been given to me.

Q. Have you seen any given to any others?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is the food well cooked?—A. Yes, sir; well cooked.

Q. Is the bread sweet?—A. The bread is good.

Q. How about the meat?—A. The meat and bread are both very good since I have been here.

Q. Have you been kindly treated and well taken care of?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any statement you wish to make?—A. None at all.

Q. None of the doctors are here, and nobody having any charge of the institution; you are before a Senate committee, and are free to speak about anything to us.—A. I understand.

Q. How is it about the attention of the physicians to you?—A. First-rate, sir. Come here and you can see (exhibiting an amputated foot).

Q. You came here with a wounded foot?—A. Yes, sir; frost-bitten.

Q. And it was amputated?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they have taken excellent care of you?—A. Yes, sir.

JOHN BRESNAHAN (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been at the hospital?—Answer. Since the 11th of January, in this ward. I was, two weeks before that, upstairs for six days; got a relapse, and came in again, and requested to be brought into this ward.

Q. What is your treatment in the hospital?—A. I find my treatment right good; so far as doctoring, the best I ever saw, for I have been sick for the last eight years, and tried a good many doctors in the city, and never found a more experienced doctor, to my knowledge, than Drs. Glennan and Palmer. I made application to them for two weeks, coming in for medicine, and never found it so good in my behalf.

Q. Are the doctors attentive? Are they here every day?—A. Most every day. Dr. Glennan comes twice a day to visit the patients. I requested him, once, to give me a change of diet, and so he did. I find the diet always good enough.

Q. Does Dr. Palmer come also about the hospital?—A. He does not come to this ward unless he goes through to inspect it.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Does he come through to inspect it?—A. I see him coming through once a week, regularly.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is the food you get good?—A. As good as I ever saw in any place for the like of a hospital. I get very good, healthy corn-bread; very good, healthy wheat-flour bread; hominy, rice, coffee, and tea, enough for me to eat.

Q. How is it about potatoes?—A. We get potatoes, too.

Q. As many as you want?—A. No; not quite as many as I want. Sometimes I get one or two. Sometimes, perhaps, I do not care about potatoes for my disease at this time; they do not suit it very well.

Q. There is no stinting in any kind of food—potatoes, or anything else, is there?—A. I see enough to eat, for myself, more than I can eat, since I have come in.

Q. Do others about you in the ward seem to have enough?—A. I cannot account for them. I see everybody, when he asks for more, getting it.

Q. How about the cleanliness of the room and beds?—A. It is just as you see it now.

Q. It looks clean to me now.—A. It has to be cleaned every day after the night; when the nurses come in the morning they clean it up; and it is at this time of the day every day as you see it now.

Q. Has it always been so since you have been here?—A. Always since I have been here attended to and washed every other morning or through the day.

Q. It has been so ever since you have been here?—A. Ever since I have been here.

WILLIAM WILLIAMSON (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been here?—Answer. Two months.

Q. How do you find your treatment here?—A. I find it pretty well on the food, but very slim in clothing.

Q. The government did not give you a suit of clothes when you came?—A. No, sir.

Q. What disorder did you come with?—A. My toe was cut off.

Q. Frost-bitten?—A. No, sir; crushed.

Q. And you thought the government ought to have given you a suit of clothes?—A. Yes.

Q. Which it did not do?—A. It did not do it.

Q. You say your food is good?—A. Yes, sir; the food is good.

Q. Do the doctors take good care of your foot?—A. Yes, sir; they take good care of my foot.

Q. Is the hospital generally as clean as it is here?—A. Just this way all the time.

Q. And has been all the time you have been here?—A. Yes, sir.

HENRY BAER (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What position do you fill in this ward?—Answer. Attending to the sick, keeping them clean, feeding them, and attending to their medicine.

Q. Is this ward No. 1?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been in this hospital in that employ?—A. I have been connected with the Freedmen's Hospital some thirteen years.

Q. Have you been in this hospital ever since it was started?—A. No, sir; I was up-stairs at the time Dr. Reyburn was here, and there were two nurses down here. Dr. Palmer took them up-stairs and brought me down here.

Q. What kind of food has been given to the patients during the last two or three years?—A. Beef, hominy, rice, fish in season, sweet potatoes, and all such things.

Q. Are the articles good in quality?—A. Yes, sir; sometimes it is not cooked or something is not so good.

Q. Occasionally an article of meat may not be well cooked?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is the cooking generally?—A. The cooking generally is pretty good. Sometimes it is not cooked as well as others, but sometimes again it is cooked pretty well. We hardly see anything about it.

Q. Are the same cooks here now that were three months ago?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the same there were three years ago?—A. There are some new cooks, I think, within three years.

Q. Better cooks?—A. They have shifted them.

Q. Are the cooks as good as ever they were here?—A. Well, we had some cooks four or five years ago that I think were a little better than these here; but they are pretty good cooks.

Q. How much change has there been in the cooks during that time? Tell the names of the cooks that were here four or five years ago that are not here now.—A. Of the women there was Ann Henrietta Gant, Hester Armstead, and then Fred Frazier and Louisa Frazier his wife, and that was about all.

Q. They were here four or five years ago?—A. Yes, or more than that, perhaps.

Q. Tell us those who were here three years ago who are not here now.—A. Hester Armstead, I think, is one of them, as near as I can get at it, and Ann Henrietta Gant. That is about all.

Q. How many of those who are here now were here three years ago?—A. Butler, John, Sam, and Eliza Gray. Those I know were.

Q. Who is the head cook now?—A. Butler is on the full diet; that is, for the dining-room.

Q. Do you always keep this ward as clean as it is now?—A. It is as clean as ever since I have been here, and I keep it as clean. It was not as clean when I first came and that was the reason of the shifting.

Q. How long is it since you came here?—A. I think it has been about four years.

Q. Then during the last four years you have kept this ward as clean as it is now?—A. Yes, sir; I kept it as clean from the first start after the change of nurses. That is what they made the change for. Ever since then it has been kept just as you see it now. Any time you would have found it just as it is now. I kept it so. If I attend to anything, I do it right or I do not want to do it at all.

WARD NO. II.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been at the hospital?—Answer. July 9, 1877, I came. I have been here seven months or over.

Q. What is the trouble with you?—A. My sickness?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I do not know. I have never been able to tell anything about my sickness until yesterday. The doctor examined me yesterday very closely. I have had a trouble. I have not been able to sit down in a chair without great pain for the last eight or ten months. I seem to have soreness in me somewhere. I did not know whether it was under my testicles or in my rectum. I was under the impression that it was in my rectum. I have told the doctor several times it was in my rectum, but they seemed to think no, it was in the urethra, and they treated me for the urethra and have treated me seven months, and here I am to-day worse than I was when they commenced to treat me. I insisted that the doctors should examine my rectum; I thought something was wrong with it. I commenced to pass blood the last two or three days. I told the doctor I was not going to suffer longer, and intimated I would get an outside physician. So he examined my rectum and found my bowels all ulcerated; so he told me; and now he is treating me for that. That is all I know about it. I never knew before. He said he thought it was inflammation of the urethra. He was not sure; he only thought it was inflammation of the urethra. I think, though, that they have got to it now, because I was satisfied it was in my rectum.

Q. What statement have you to make with reference to the food of the hospital?—A. Now, I have not anything to say, more than it is very good, enough to satisfy any person at all. I am very well satisfied myself and have been for a month or two. I get enough to eat now, and get food that is fit to eat now in the last two months, or probably a little longer.

Q. Do you eat it from the mess-table, or is your food specially prescribed for you?—It is not specially prescribed for me. There is an extra beefsteak now prescribed for me, and has been for about a couple of months. That is all the extra food I get, a piece of beefsteak.

Q. There is a distinction between the mess-table and the wards. Which head do you come under?—A. I come under the ward. I cannot go to the mess-room.

Q. Has that been so with you all the time? Have you always come under the ward-head?—A. Always under the ward. I have always taken my meals in the ward.

Q. Then you do not know anything personally about the mess-table?—A. I have seen it; I never ate anything from it. I was ordered to eat in there, and I went outside and took my meals in a restaurant. I told Dr. Palmer that rather than eat there I would go out.

Q. What restaurant did you go to?—A. To the Morton House on F street.

Q. Give me an idea when you went there?—A. I do not remember the day. I went out many times—not once, but several times.

Q. Do you know the proprietor of the Morton House?—A. No, I do not know anybody there.

Q. Do you know the steward, waiter, or cook?—A. No person.

Q. How often did you go there?—A. I think only on one occasion; that day I had to go to the Interior Department, and it brought me over to the Morton House. I went down there in the basement; a German man waited on me; I do not know who he was.

Q. What other restaurant did you go to?—A. I just dropped in now and then to get a meal.

Q. Have you done that within the last month or two?—A. No; I have not been out of this bed in two months.

Q. Did you have to go to bed soon after coming to the hospital?—A. No, sir; when I came to the hospital I had been sick some time, but I did not go to bed for a long time. I have only been put in this bed the last sixty-five or seventy days, I think, a little over two months. I have been here altogether about seven months. I can tell you near about what months I went out and got my meals.

Q. At the Morton House?—A. At different restaurants; I do not know exactly; I cannot say because I did not take the time, but I know about the time I had to go out to get food fit to eat. Everybody here knows that I did go out for that purpose. They would not give me anything to eat in that ward—told me I must eat in the mess-house. I had either to do that or go out; so I went out.

Q. What days did you go out?—A. What days in the week?

Q. Yes.—A. I cannot tell you that.

Q. What was your objection; that there was not enough food, or that it was not good?—A. Two objections. It was not good. I do not say there was not enough in the mess-house, because I did not eat any of it. I could not tell how much would satisfy me till I ate.

Q. What article of food was not good?—A. I saw rusty-looking pork there, such as I have seen up in the ward; it looked just the same to me; and corn-bread and coffee.

Q. Was the corn-bread bad?—A. It was not bad. I suppose it was good corn-meal, but it was made up very poorly—just bread and meal and water.

Q. You did not taste the pork?—A. I did not taste anything.

Q. Then you do not know whether it tasted good or not?—A. No, sir; I did not sit down.

Q. You did not sit down to the table at all, and did not taste any of the food?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Was there white bread also on the table?—A. I think there was. I am not sure.

Q. You did not taste it?—A. No.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You do not know, then, whether it was good or bad?—A. No, sir; not by the taste. I do not know anything about the mess-house food.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Have you been up at all, or so that you could go to the mess-table, since you have been placed in this bed?—A. I have been well enough to walk out in the street, but I have had no constitutional sickness. The doctor says if I can walk, to walk. I have, I think, about twice or three times walked out in the street down Seventh street.

Q. Now you say you never ate at this mess-house?—A. In this time I have not been there at all.

Q. But from the time you first came you would not go to the mess-house and would not eat there?—A. I never sat down there at all.

Q. How did you get your food during all that time?—A. Before or after?

Q. Before you were put on this bed?—A. It was brought here in the ward.

Q. Although you could walk to the mess-house, still you had your food brought here?—A. Brought here in the ward.

Q. Was it good or bad?—A. This was good food I am telling about now.

Q. I am speaking now of the time from the 9th of July until sixty-five days ago?—A. Yes, sir; I think I can give you an explanation.

Q. I want to ask you. You say you did not eat at the mess-house at any time?—A. No.

Q. Where, then, did you get your meals during those five months, or whatever time it was?—A. When I came in on the 9th of July, I came into this ward. I was a man who could not sit down and could not go around amongst the crowd; the doctor ordered me. I did not say anything to him about it here in the ward. The nurse brought my meals in with the meals of the rest of the patients, and I ate them the best I could. At first I did not get enough.

Q. In the first place you did not eat at the mess-house?—A. No, sir; he did not tell me to go there at first.

Q. And your meals were brought in here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, what were they; what did they consist of?—A. For breakfast I would get fish, a piece of mackerel, and that mackerel very often was tainted and smelt bad, and was so salty that a well man could hardly eat it if he had been shoveling coal; he would not have appetite to consume it. Besides, it smelt tainted and rotten; I do not mean to say it was completely rotten, but it was tainted and bad—smelt very bad. I got a mackerel, a piece of wheat-bread, and a cup of coffee; no butter. That is what I got for my breakfast, and that was all.

Q. What did you get for dinner?—A. An Irish potato, that big around [illustrating], and I would swear it was no larger; it was in its jacket, and only one; a piece of bread, a cup of soup, and a piece of beef that had the muscles of the beef's leg in it. I know meat well. I am a caterer, have kept a restaurant, and am a pretty good judge of meats, and I could just look at it and see the muscles of the leg in it. It was so hard I could hardly bite it. Sometimes I would eat it if I did not feel well enough to go home to my mother's house, but I went there if I could manage to crawl out. I would tell the nurse I was hungry and ask him to get me more. He said they would not give it to him, and would not allow me to have more.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What was the name of the nurse?—A. Lucius Hawkins and Henry Saunders. I would say, "Please go down and try to get me a little more beef; I have not enough to sustain me, and I am getting weak and sick."

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Where does your mother live?—A. At the corner of Beale and Monroe streets, Georgetown.

Q. You used to go there and get your meals?—A. I did.

Q. And to this restaurant?—A. Yes, sir; I would just buy what I was able to pay for. I did not have any money of any consequence. I have always had a little money. I would get twenty-five cents' worth of something to eat, the best I could do for that, pork and beans, or something of that kind—no regular board.

Q. Did you make complaint to the surgeon of the hospital of the food in the ward?—A. I told him the food was bad, rotten, smelt bad; that I did not get enough of it, and had to go home and get something to eat.

Q. What did he say to that?—A. He said, "You know very well you do not get rotten food," and holloed at me and looked pretty sharp. I said, "Doctor, I might as well tell you up and down I cannot live on that stuff; I am a man that generally speaks just like I think, and I tell you I get rotten food. My meat is rotten, and it is not any lie of my own making. I must tell you the truth. Every man in the ward knows it. I have called patients and asked them to smell it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What is this doctor's name to whom you told this?—A. Dr. Purvis. This is what I said on the first occasion. Then I told them all so afterwards. I said to the nurse, "Come here; I want you to see my food." I showed it to him and said, "You see that meat is green; no smell it; does it not smell like rotten?" He said, "Yes." I called the other ones and showed it.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. The same men whose names you have given?—A. The same names.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is the same food given to you in this ward as to those in other wards?—A. I only know that by hearsay. They tell me it is the same. I have asked them over and over again.

Q. Have you inquired in Ward No. 1, right underneath?—A. Frequently I have talked with patients. They tell me the same thing.

Q. Give me the name of a patient of the lower ward, ward one, that has told you.—A. There are so many going in and out that I do not know the name of one.

Q. Can you give us one?—A. I do not remember one—well, yes, there is one named Callahan told me.

Q. Is Callahan there now?—A. I think he is. I do not know for sure. Several of them have told me that. A man named Murphy, I think, told me, but I am not positive, because I do not remember such things as that.

Q. You speak of the food at the mess-table in certain charges filed with the Secretary of the Interior. Did you write those charges yourself?—A. Yes; I wrote them.

Q. You wrote them yourself?—A. I did.

Q. Is the paper in your handwriting in the department?—A. The charges filed with the Secretary of the Interior against the Freedmen's Hospital were written and filed by me.

Q. In your handwriting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I ask you to write your name right there on the piece of paper I hand you; or write, "this is a pleasant day in February," and sign your name, or write any other immaterial thing you see fit.—A. I am not in very good condition to write now, but I will try.

[A piece of paper was handed to the witness and he wrote.]

I am very nervous now. I was sitting up when I wrote that. I can write half a dozen different hands, but this is the hand I wrote them charges in (pointing to what he had just written). Here is some of my writing you can see, the same as those charges. There is the same identical hand (exhibiting a paper). This is a paper I drew up for a friend of mine. I cannot write very well, now, because I am too nervous, too sick. I have been lying in bed two months. That is enough to break a man up.

Q. Have you, during the last five months, walked about the hospital much?—A. Yes, sir; when I am not very real sore I get up and walk every time I can.

Q. How often do you walk?—A. I have not walked for a month now, I believe.

Q. How often were you accustomed to walk before that?—A. When I first came to the hospital I walked every day.

Q. Where did you walk?—A. Out on the hills and over the streets and down in the city, as far as I could, until I would take the cars. I never laid down until I could not go any longer.

Q. You were allowed to remain here when you were going all over the city, and had money to buy your food elsewhere?—A. They did not allow me any money. I bought food with money my friends gave me. They do not care here where you go. There is no rule.

Q. How is it about the cleanliness of the hospital?—A. It is very good now, but it was very bad when I came in here and for two or three months after I was here.

Q. You say that these floors are more clean now than they were three months ago?—A. No; these floors were about as clean when I came here as now. They always looked very clean and nice. I spoke about the utensils, the bedding, the bed-clothing, the mattresses.

Q. Is the bed-clothing different?—A. Every mattress in the ward has been taken out and a different kind substituted for them; here is the kind I first got, a straw tick all filled with blood—looked like a man had been cut up on it, excrements and everything else.

Q. Did you open it to see?—A. I do not mean inside. I mean on this part [putting his hand on the outside of the mattress]. I have often seen it.

Q. What do you call this tick here now?—A. I do not know; something that has been on it ever since I have had it.

Q. Did you say that this had been changed?—A. I say this has been on this mattress ever since I have had this mattress. This is a new mattress. It is not the one I had. After the investigation commenced they brought this mattress, and they brought that one [indicating] and all here.

Q. I see a spot on this. It would look as if it was not put here new on account of any investigation, for if so why did they bring you one with a spot on it?—A. These things are not all new. Here is a blanket

that was put on me two or three days ago. It is supposed to be a new blanket, but it is not a new blanket. I know that.

Q. It looks like a comfortable and clean one?—A. It is a comfortable one and clean.

Q. Do you object that it is not new?—A. I do not, but I saw some lice come off one that came in the same lot two or three days ago. It could not be very clean under those circumstances.

Q. Where did you see them?—A. Off that third bed. The man there got them off and showed them.

Q. Do you mean Mr. Felton?—A. No, not Mr. Felton; but a new man, a soldier, who has been here only two or three days.

Q. Do you not know that patients coming in newly to a hospital bring lice with them sometimes?—A. Sometimes they do.

Q. May not this soldier have been showing his own lice?—A. It might have been. I do not know. He was a very clean-looking man, though, when he came here. He is not a soldier now, but he has done service in the field. He came here from New York. He has been with his wife and family.

Q. A white or a colored man?—A. A colored man.

Q. How old is he?—A. About 45 or 50 years old. He is not right out of the Army. He has been out of the Army since 1864 or 1865. He went in in 1861.

Q. Are there any persons with contagious diseases in this ward at present?—A. No, sir; this ward is in very good condition at the present time, but there has been lots of them.

Q. Give us the names of any patients ever here with a contagious disease.—A. One old man—I do not know his name—and a man called Ross, nearly opposite me—old Pap Ross.

Q. You say he had a contagious disease; what was it?—A. I did not ask him, so I do not know; I did not talk to him much; he had the end of his penis off; I think it is syphilis.

Q. Is that a contagious disease?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Except between the sexes, and in separate beds?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is what you mean when you speak in your charges of contagious diseases?—A. Not only syphilis, but there is men here right in the wards that has been almost in a large lump of matter with consumption, coughing and spitting around; all of them drinking out of the same dipper that I am compelled to drink out of, the only one here. There are men with scrofula. There is a boy here now with scrofula; he is almost rotten with it; he has been here, and is now.

Q. What is his name?—A. John Norris.

Q. What ward is he in?—A. This ward; he sleeps in that third bed.

Q. I see they all have separate beds here?—A. Yes, sir; I did not file any charges against the hospital at the present time. I filed charges against the hospital up to and taking in all previous to September and October. Of course I do not prefer charges now.

Q. This document that I hold in my hand, which you say you wrote, does not make any distinction, so far as I see, between September and subsequently.—A. It does at this time.

Q. I have discovered no such distinction; if I do I will correct my statement. Do you say that you wrote that document?—A. It is not my handwriting.

Q. It is a copy of it?—A. I guess it is.

Q. You think that the consumptive patients should be turned out of the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. But why not, if it is so disagreeable to have them here?—A. I have

seen other hospitals where consumptive patients, bad ones like them, where people cannot sleep in the ward without being woke up five or eight or nine times a night, are put into a room. I have always seen them isolated. I have seen it at Providence Hospital and other hospitals where I have been in through visiting.

Q. I suppose you are aware that the appropriation for this hospital is limited. You know how much more attendance it would take to put a consumptive person in a room by himself, to see that he did not die in the night, and had his wants attended to; or did you never think of that?—A. I have seen them put in a room and left there to die in there for that matter, and nobody ever went in the room where he was for twenty-four hours. It has been done here in the last two months past.

Q. Who was the nurse that neglected his duty in that way? Give me his name.—A. The man's name was Hawkins—the man is in this ward.

Q. Mr. Hawkins is the one who having a patient in charge did not go in to him for twenty-four hours?—A. I do not say positively twenty-four hours, but I say eighteen or twenty hours, or probably twenty-four. Of course I did not mark the hours down. He did not go in there all night; never went into the room to him all night and pretty near all day.

Q. Where is that room?—A. At the other end of this ward.

Q. Is that not out of your sight?—A. Out of my sight.

Q. During the last two months you have been in this bed?—A. Yes, sir. If you want to restrict me right down, I do not mean to say it might not have been three months. I do not know the day and date.

Q. What was the name of that patient?—A. I have seen one or two of them put in there under the same circumstances. This one, I think, was named Rider.

Q. Is he still in the hospital?—A. He is dead and gone. He died in there and was found in there stiff.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You remember that you are now testifying under oath?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of your own knowledge that this nurse did not go in there for 20 or 24 hours?—A. Eighteen or 20 or 24.

Q. Were you awake all the while.—A. No, sir; I was not awake. I only take it from what the patients say.

Q. Then you do not know it?—A. No.

Q. Then say that you do not know it?—A. The nurse said it himself. He told me. Of course I did not watch the room.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You say Mr. Hawkins told you he did not go in to this patient for 18 or 24 hours?—A. Mr. Hawkins told me he was so busy in this ward that there was a man lying in that room that he could not go in and attend to as he should.

Q. And on the strength of that you say he did not go in for 18 or 20 hours?—A. Yes, sir; for a good long time. I am telling you to the best of my knowledge now. Of course I am under oath. I do not mean to name the hours particularly, because I might be wrong. I did not take the time.

Q. In these charges you say something about Dr. Palmer allowing private persons to keep their cows in the hospital yard, which are fed by government feed. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—A. I said that in the charges, and I believe I proved that.

Q. I ask what you know of it?—A. I do not know of my own knowledge what feed they got. I know what I heard a man swear to.

Q. That is not an answer to my question.—A. That is all I know.

Q. Then you know nothing of your own knowledge?—A. I do not.

Q. These charges were put in before you heard anybody swear about it, were they not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Give me the name of any witness who knows that the feed for these cows was furnished at government expense.—A. Daniel Reed. I am pretty sure it was Daniel Reed.

Q. Where is he? In the hospital?—A. He was here.

Q. Where is he now?—A. I cannot tell you. I suppose he works here. He is a driver. He does not stay here; he is out all the time.

Q. Who else?—A. Robert Delany, I think, is the other's name. He has charge of the feed.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How did you discover this fact in order to put it in your charges?—A. About this feed?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I came here. I was not completely dumb. I saw three very fine cows here the first time I came in, and I was admiring them. I knew nothing about the premises and place, but I thought they were quite pretty cows, and I happened to say to one of the employes, "Those are three beautiful cows; do you keep those cows here all the time?" He laughed, and says, "I am not allowed to say." I said, "Do these cows belong to the hospital?" and he said, "No." Afterward I found out one of them was sold to a private man outside.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. How did you find that out?—A. I saw the man have the cow, and he showed it to me and told me he bought it at the hospital, from one of the surgeons. That is how I know it.

Q. How many night-nurses are there in this ward?—A. There has only been one since I have been here.

Q. Is there one night-nurse in this ward every night?—A. Yes, sir; for the last two or three nights one of the patients has been sitting up here, helping the nurse.

Q. It has been the regular custom since you have been here to employ a night-nurse for this ward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For each ward?—A. I do not say that.

Q. You do not say of the other wards, of your own knowledge?—A. I do not.

Q. What did you mean, then, by stating, in your written charges, that they have abolished the custom of employing a night-nurse for each ward?—A. There is a night-nurse in this ward.

Q. Do you know, of your own personal knowledge, that the custom has been abolished, or that there is not a night-nurse in each ward?—A. All I know about it is, that the nurse here cannot do what he ought to do, and he tells me—

Q. That is not a response to the question.—A. They call him out to go to other wards. I only know about this ward.

Q. Then the custom is not abolished of having a night-nurse in this ward?—A. Not in this ward.

Q. What is the custom in this ward when any person dies in it about removing the body to the dead-house?—A. In what respect?

Q. Are they laid out here and washed, dressed, and removed, or are they taken at once—the moment they die—to the dead-house?—A. All

I have seen of it is this: I see men dying here, and I see them going to get the dirty clothes they came in here with, put them on a stretcher, and take them right off to the dead-house. I cannot tell you any more. I can't tell you what I heard; but that is what I see.

Q. They are not washed?—A. I do not see them washed.

Q. Do you know they are not?—A. I do not say they are not washed. I only tell you I see them put on their dirty clothes.

Q. The clothes they came to the hospital in?—A. Yes. I saw it, and was astonished; and I asked if these were the clothes they came in with, and they told me yes.

Q. How long after they die are they removed to the dead-house?—A. As soon as they can get on the clothes they put them on a stretcher.

Q. Then you say they are not washed and not dressed?—A. I never saw them washed.

Q. You never saw anything done except putting the clothes on?—A. I do not remember seeing them do anything more than putting the clothes on and putting them on a stretcher.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. How many have died in this ward since you have been here?—A. I cannot begin to tell. I know a great many.

Q. One hundred?—A. I cannot say positively it was one hundred; but I am pretty sure there has been somewhere between twenty-five and one hundred. I cannot say how many.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Between twenty-five and one hundred in this ward here in the last seven or eight months?—A. There may have been sixty.

Q. In this ward, since July, there have been from twenty-five to one hundred dying—you think about sixty?—A. No; I do not say I think about sixty.

Q. What do you say?

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. More than twenty-five, and less than one hundred?—A. That is what I say. I am pretty confident there has been more than twenty-five and less than one hundred. I did not count them.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do you know what the expenses of the hospital are a year?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Did you not state in your charges what the expenses were?—A. No, sir; I did not, because I never knew.

Q. Did you not state in the 10th article of these charges that "the hospital under its present management does not exceed \$25,000 per annum in cost"?—A. Yes, sir; I did that.

Q. How did you state it if you do not know?—A. I made them out as near as I could come to it. I was under the impression that was about what it was.

Q. What are the elements of your calculation?—A. I have a memorandum that I could refer to.

Q. Have you your memorandum here?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where is it?—A. I cannot think where it is, because I have so many papers in different places. I think I destroyed it. I am pretty sure I have. I made a calculation, of course. The medicines were something I did not touch and go into, but I went into everything else pretty near except medicines and made a pretty good calculation, and I came to that conclusion as near as possible.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Who aided you in getting up these things? Who helped you to get up these charges generally?—A. Of course I had counsel and had consultation with him.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Did he get up the statement, or did you get it up?—A. About these calculations?

Q. Yes.—A. I made a calculation myself of my own, a rough calculation, and then I revised it a little. Of course I showed it to him, and on consultation I believe he made a rough estimate.

Q. Do you know what the rent paid by the hospital is?—A. Yes, sir; I do now.

Q. Did you at the time you made the calculation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much is it?—A. Two thousand dollars now. So I understand it. Of course, I do not know it, but I understand it to be that.

Q. What is the paper you have in your hand?—A. Nothing concerning this matter.

Q. Do you know how many nurses there are employed in the institution?—A. No, sir; I do not know how many.

Q. Do you know what wages are paid to them?—A. I know what they told me. That is all.

Q. Have you inquired of them all?—A. I might have left out one or two. I have inquired of a good many of them.

Q. What their wages were?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Give me the names of those you have inquired what their wages were, outside of this ward.—A. There is Mr. Chase.

Q. You asked Mr. Chase, did you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ward is he in?—A. I do not know. It is over in that ward. (Pointing.)

Q. Whom else did you ask?—A. I think I asked a man down-stairs named Streets, a day-nurse.

Q. Any other?—A. I asked another nurse, named William Brown. I asked one of the female nurses, named Keziah Briggs.

Q. When did you ask this question?—A. I cannot tell you; really, I do not know the month or the day.

Q. Six months ago, or two months ago?—A. Since I have been here, inside of six or seven months; I do not know how long it has been.

Q. Can you not come somewhere near it? Did you ask them all about the same time or at different times?—A. I asked them at different times.

Q. Do you know what the physicians are paid?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ask them?—A. No, sir; I did not have anything to say to them.

Q. How much are the physicians paid?—A. I do not know exactly. I cannot tell you. I have got that here, I think. Of course I cannot remember all these things (Examining papers). I have a little rough calculation here.

Q. Is that the calculation you are speaking about?—A. No, sir; this is something else. It is only a mere memorandum. I will show it to you. Now, there is my memorandum (handing a paper); I took it out of the Congressional appropriation bill, which I got at one of the departments. I made it out because they tied me up in knots.

Q. What do you mean by saying you were tied up in knots? Explain what they were.—A. Well, the things they did.

Q. Were they injurious to you individually?—A. Not injurious to me that I know of.

Q. What do you mean by "knots" and being "tied up"?—A. They tried to puzzle me; put questions to me. I have had questions put to me that I thought was not altogether fair.

Q. Was that since the charges?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you explain that you went into this careful calculation on account of their trying to puzzle you and tying you up into knots, when you seem to have made the calculation before filing the charges?—A. I will give you a full explanation in regard to this thing, but not in regard to the knots.

Q. You say, in explanation of your having these memoranda, that you made them up on account of your finding they were asking you puzzling questions, and trying to puzzle you, since the investigation commenced?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I want to know why you make a statement showing that you made the calculation before the charges themselves, which were before any such questions were asked you?—A. I did not say I marked this down before any questions were asked me or any charges made.

Q. How then does it appear that \$25,000 foots up the same as in the charges?—A. I have referred to the book I got this from on three or four different occasions in the department. I can find them there. I have been there on several different occasions.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What department?—A. The Treasury Department was the first place I ever went in regard to this. I did not take any memoranda there, or if I did I lost it, and I merely made this to put in my pocket to jog my memory.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I have any further statement to make.

Q. You said something in the charges about idiots and lunatics being in the asylum?—A. I did.

Q. Do you think it is not a proper place for them?—A. I never heard of idiots and lunatics being kept at a hospital, and going around like I have seen some of them here.

Q. Do you think they should be turned out?—A. I do not think anything at all.

Q. Are you not aware that they were the ones this hospital was originally organized for, and were named in the act of Congress as the ones that should be kept here?—A. I did not know that. I think the lunatic asylum is the place for them.

Q. That lunatic asylum is for those whose insanity occurs in the District. These persons came from contraband camps, &c., and elsewhere.—A. I thought the lunatic asylum was a government institution.

Q. But that is the distinction the law makes.—A. I never knew that before.

Q. Then the charges you make against the doctors of keeping lunatics and idiots here should be modified by that consideration, should they not?—A. Of course that modifies it a little, I suppose.

Q. Is there any other statement you want to make of any other kind?—A. If there is no other place these men could be sent to—

Q. It seems there is no other place.—A. These lunatics assault some people in the yard. They never assaulted me, because I was never out in the yard much.

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make about anything?—
A. Not as I know of.

Q. There is no other statement you wish to make now?—A. Not now.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. You say your business is that of a caterer?—A. Yes, sir; I have kept a restaurant.

Q. In this city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?—A. On E street, near the National Theater—about three or four doors from the theater.

Q. How did you get into this hospital?—A. I came here through the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. You applied to him for admission here?—A. No, I was sick; I did not go there myself at all.

Q. Were you carried here, and then application made for your admission?—A. They admitted me without any certificate at all, so far as that is concerned.

Q. You came right in here?—A. Yes, sir. I do not know who went and got the permission from the Interior Department.

Q. I do not care about details. Have you ever been in any other hospital?—A. No, sir; not to be a patient.

Q. And never have been in this until this time?—A. Never seen any of it until I came into it. I might have been inside the gate, or something like that, but I do not remember ever coming across the sill of the gate till now.

Q. Who was the counsel whom you consulted in getting up these charges?—A. Franklin E. Felton.

FRANKLIN E. FELTON (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. How long have you been in this hospital?—Answer. I came here on the 16th of April last.

Q. Did you prepare the charges which Mr. Johnson signed?—A. I draughted them and he wrote them.

Q. Did he copy them?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. What is your profession?—A. Lawyer. I might as well add that I was acting at that time in the capacity of Mr. Johnson's counsel, as the complainant in this case.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Were you then in the hospital?—A. I was.

Q. Have you received a fee from him?—A. No, sir; I never have received one cent for any service I have rendered in the matter of the whole investigation, nor do I ever expect to. On the contrary, I have paid for incidental expenses out of my own funds.

Q. Have you funds of your own?—A. Out of remittances I received.

Q. Do you receive remittances?—A. I receive sometimes trifling remittances to pay my wash-bills, and so forth.

Q. How much remittances do you receive?—A. Not regular.

Q. From whom do you receive them?—A. I receive them from my family.

Q. Is your family able to make remittances to you?—A. They are able to make remittances for my incidental expenses here.

Q. Who are your family?—A. What do you mean by that?

Q. You speak of your family; who are they; what is your family?—

A. I have one brother living.

Q. Who is he?—A. Mr. Samuel M. Felton, of Philadelphia.

Q. What is his business?—A. He is the president of the Pennsylvania Steel Company, and he is connected with several railroad companies.

Q. A very wealthy man?—A. That I cannot say.

Q. Are you under the impression that he is?—A. That I do not know.

Q. He is aware that you are here in this hospital, is he?—A. O, yes.

Q. He is the one from whom you receive remittances, is he?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You can make any statement of matters within your own knowledge in the hospital. Being a lawyer, you understand that.—A. I will. I came to this hospital on the 16th of April last. I came from Providence Hospital here. I was suffering at the time from paraplegia, or partial paralysis, which affected my lower limbs exclusively. I left Providence Hospital voluntarily, because I could not get there the services of a male nurse, which my disease actually and imperatively required, and therefore I came here where I could have the services of such a nurse, and I have found one that is very valuable and skillful.

Q. Who is that?—A. His name is Lucius Hawkins.

Q. Is he attentive about the ward to the patients generally?—A. Wonderfully so. He is the best nurse I have ever seen. He is in this ward. He is the best nurse, the most attentive and most skillful.

Q. Does he take care of the patients generally, or does he show favoritism to you?—A. He shows no favoritism at all. He does his duty faithfully. He comes here at six o'clock in the morning and leaves at six o'clock at night, and he never is idle, and he attends to every one faithfully, and to the utmost of his skill and ability.

Q. Do you know of his leaving patients for eighteen or twenty-four hours without going near them?—A. Never; not within my knowledge or experience, and, from my knowledge of the character of the man, I do not believe anything of the kind.

Q. You can proceed.—A. When I entered the hospital I was assigned to ward No. 1, which is the ward below here, under the charge of Dr. Gleman. The nurses there were a man by the name of Baer, and another one by the name of Street. I was given a bed in the middle section of the ward. A new mattress was brought from the big brick building and put on my bed. That night I was unable to sleep at all, as the bed-bugs literally swarmed over me; and in the morning I complained to the nurse Baer, and he seemed to treat it as a matter of indifference. I spoke of it to several of the patients, and they seemed to regard it as a joke, and said there was not a bed in the ward that was not filled with bed-bugs. I finally, by giving fifty cents to the nurse, got him to take away the old straw ticking, that was black and filthy, and looked as though it had been in use from time immemorial, and give me a new straw ticking. The blankets on the bed were old; they were filled with dust; they were full of holes. The bed-spread was ragged and dirty, and I do not think it had ever been washed, although it had evidently been in use for many years. And yet my bed, when I got the straw ticking upon it, was the best bed in the ward. There were cockroaches in the room, and there were lice on the patients, and the whole thing was repulsive and disgusting to me. The morning after I arrived, Street, the nurse, came to me with a basin and towel. I had seen him go to patients who were afflicted with scrofula, with syphilis, with ulcers, and other horrible diseases. They washed in this basin and wiped on the towel. I positively refused to use either the basin or the

towel. I then asked Baer if I could not have a towel, and he said no, but there was a towel that hung up for the use of all the patients that were able to be out of bed, and I could use that. I looked at it, and it was as black as a piece of charcoal. I said, "I cannot use that," and went out into the bath-room and washed my face and hands under the spigot, and wiped them upon my handkerchief.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Was this nurse a colored man?—A. All these nurses here are colored.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Proceed.—A. In the ward there were two patients that were literally rotten with syphilis. They presented the most repulsive aspect I have ever seen. One of them was named Jackson. He has since died—died of that horrible disease, a mere mass of putrefaction. At that time he had a hole eaten through his skull, through his forehead, over his eye, so that you could see the brain. There were other holes eaten in his skull. His left hand, I think it was, was so affected that it hung in this way [indicating], as I learned, the disease having eaten through the wrist joint. His whole body was covered with a mass of sores and he was bedridden, and if he required to be moved it took two or three persons a long while to move him, and they had to handle him with the utmost care. The other man's name is Anderson. I think he is here now, or he was the last I heard. He was at that time bedridden. He was also covered with sores, and he had no hair on his head. Every day I noticed that they used to bind him in an oil-sheet, as it appeared to me. Since I left the ward the man has so far recovered as to be out of bed, and if he is here now, you will see him moving along on his posteriors, propelling himself by his hands.

Q. Why take this time in describing these diseases? Of course we understand this is a hospital, and men are brought here with dreadful diseases.—A. Then I will proceed. There was another man there named Saunders, who was completely paralyzed. He was bedridden, and he had no control over his bowels. That man used to be allowed to lie in his filth from six o'clock in the night until nine o'clock the next morning. Food of the coarsest kind was carried to his bed three times a day and placed by his bedside. He was unable to eat it. The nurse often-times did not feed him. The man was utterly neglected, and he died. One of the patients, John A. Parker, who is now at the Soldiers' Home at Augusta, wrote a letter, which I saw—

Q. No matter about what letters you saw. State what you know of your own knowledge.—A. Very well. I state that. I saw the letter.

Q. Of course it is not evidence.—A. It is at the Interior Department, and, if you wish, you can have it. What is your object; to get as much information as possible?

Q. Our object is to have each patient state what he knows of his own knowledge. We will call for the letter, and it will speak for itself.—A. I stated that I saw the letter, which was a fact. As a lawyer, I state that that is a fact. The contents of the letter, of course, I am not at liberty to state; but I tell you, gentlemen, where the letter is, or where it was sent.

Mr. EATON. It is proper that you should state that a letter was written containing certain specific charges, and that that letter is to be found in such a place.—A. That was all I proposed to state. Now, in regard to the food, I simply state in regard to the food that was fur-

nished myself, of course. The meat that was furnished me was of two descriptions; it was fresh and salt. The fresh meat was to a very great extent composed of beef's cheeks and tongues cut up together; of necks, of hearts, and of shins. That meat was very often tainted, and I repeatedly complained to the nurses, and oftentimes one of the nurses would take that meat over to the kitchen and exchange it for other. Sometimes he would not. Within three weeks I was furnished with tainted meat nine times, and I complained to the nurse, M'r Street, and asked him to bring the matter to the attention of Dr. Glennan, which he declined to do. Finally I did. I told Dr. Glennan of it, and, as the result, I was put on what might be called starvation diet. I was continued on that until I lost my appetite. I could not eat the food, and I wrote a letter complaining of that fact and the condition of the food to Dr. Palmer, and the food was somewhat improved, although it was not nearly so good as it is at the present time. The salt meat consisted of salt pork, which was fat, which was yellow, and which was repulsive both to the sight and to the smell. The salt beef was as hard as paving-stones and as salt as salt could make it, and very old, evidently. The fish was salt mackerel, very old and very rotten. That I could not eat.

In regard to the water-closet, there was no urinal in it, and it was in the most filthy condition of any place I have ever seen. The floor was covered with filth, with urine, with excrements. The nurses washed their night-buckets and their bed-urinals and the cups used by consumptive patients, in the bath-tub.

Q. (By Mr. SARGENT.) Did you see that?—A. I did; often.

Q. What nurses were those?—A. The nurses of ward No. 1, and I spoke to them about it. I mentioned it.

Q. To what ones did you mention it?—A. To the nurses of ward No. 1. I saw them do it, and I saw them empty slops out of the windows of the wards also. The patients were obliged to get up, if they required to urinate in the night, and go from their beds out to the water-closet; and there was no light there, and they were obliged to use the privy, and the result was that the privy-seat and floor surrounding it was completely saturated with filth, and I have seen the floor, I should suppose, from an inch and a half to two inches deep with this horrible filth; and that I complained of repeatedly, but no attention was paid to my complaints.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Two inches deep?—A. I should suppose so. I have seen it stand in a pool all over the floor. Once myself I went in there and I fell down at full length on my back; my coat was completely drenched with it and my clothes also.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. With excrement?—A. No, sir; with urine, slops, &c. They would go to the privy to urinate there, and the urine would scatter over in places and on the floor, and besides that the night-buckets were all emptied down this privy-hole, and a great portion of their contents would be scattered over the floor; and on one or two occasions (perhaps the occasion I refer to when there was so much water on the floor) I think one of the pipes—in fact I know one of the pipes had burst and had washed all this filth together with water on to the floor, and there it stood in a pool all over the floor when I fell down in it.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. How long did it stand there?—A. This was in the evening about

6 o'clock, about dusk, when I went in, and it was there until the nurses cleaned up the next morning. They always cleaned up the bath-room and water-closet for the visit of the doctor, which was about ten o'clock in the morning. The consumptive and asthmatic patients were so very bad down there, they disturbed me so much that I was unable to sleep, and I asked permission of the doctor to be removed from that ward. He granted me that permission and I came up here.

Q. When did you come here?—A. That I would not be able to say, but I think I was in the lower ward, ward No. 1, about two months. That would bring me up here some time in June, I should judge; I am not positive. I came up here. My poor diet continued up here until I wrote to Dr. Palmer, and he had the diet changed. The water-closet here was in a very bad condition, and the beds and bedding were in about the same condition as down-stairs, although the nurses here in this ward pay very much more attention to this ward than they did down stairs, were much more cleanly. On one occasion the engineer had occasion, I think, to repair the privy and the water-closet, and it was left torn to pieces for the space of three weeks, and the patients were unable to use it. The result was that night-buckets, both day and night, used to be in this entry and also in the bath-room, and our ward was filled with the stench whenever the door was opened. The patients were put to very great inconvenience, and finally, as I could get no redress from the nurses, to whom I most frequently complained of the condition of the water-closet, I wrote a letter to Dr. Palmer, and in the course of a week that water-closet was put in order.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did they commence putting the water-closet in order the day after the letter was received?—A. I wrote the letter on Saturday to Dr. Palmer, and he came down that same morning with the engineer, Mr. Calvert, and went into the water-closet. What was done I do not know.

Q. Did they go to work the next morning to fix it up?—A. The next morning was Sunday.

Q. Did they go to work the first working-day to fix it up?—A. I know that Mr. Calvert was at work here the following week.

Q. Do you know of Dr. Palmer being absent during the time the engineer was so neglecting his duty there?—A. That was in the month of August. My impression is that Dr. Palmer was absent during that month, or a part of that month. I am not quite confident. But the condition of the water-closet was always bad.

Q. Is it bad now?—A. No, sir; it is not.

Q. What has been done with the water-closet since the engineer repaired it?—A. I requested Dr. Palmer to have a urinal put in the closet, and informed him that unless a urinal was put there it would be impossible to keep the water-closet and the bath-room clean, and there has been a urinal put there for the first time since this building has been put up.

Q. Were you in the building before you came here as a patient?—A. No, sir.

Q. How do you know it was for the first time?—A. I made an examination, and I found from the appearance of the room that there had never been one there, and I also made inquiries of Lucius Hawkins, the nurse, who has been here ever since the building was put up.

Q. Are you now testifying by hearsay?—A. No, sir; as I told you, I made an examination of the water-closet. I have satisfied myself that there never was a urinal in that water-closet until this one was put up.

Q. When was this one put up?—A. It must have been in August last, to the best of my recollection.

Q. That was before any of these charges were filed in the Interior Department, was it not?—A. Those charges were filed in August.

Q. Was it before that or after?—A. If I am not mistaken, it was the very day.

Q. On what day of the month?—A. The 30th, I think, the charges were filed. You will understand, gentlemen, about these dates.

Q. You say the urinal was put up on the 30th of August?—A. I say to the best of my recollection. I did not say it was put up then. I told you that it required about a week to repair that water-closet and to put it in order. It took about a week to make the repairs necessary, because the privy was all torn to pieces. That had to be put in order, and then the urinal had to be put up besides.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. It was all done, if it was done, in August, before these charges were filed?—A. You will understand me to say that my letter was written, if I am not mistaken, to Dr. Palmer on the very day that these charges were filed, and it took a week afterward to put the water-closet and bath-room in order.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. So it was some time in September that the urinal was put up?—A. I do not know.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. If I understand the witness correctly, he notified Dr. Palmer of these troubles?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they were immediately remedied?—A. The engineer immediately went to work; yes, sir. So far as the dates are concerned, I wish you to understand I do not bear them in mind.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is there any other subject you wish to speak of?—A. There is another thing. I was asked about Dr. Palmer's absence. Dr. Palmer should have known the condition of the water-closet, and would if he had attended to his duty properly. Every Saturday it is customary for the medical corps to make an inspection, as they call it, of the hospital premises. If Dr. Palmer had examined, on those inspections, the condition of the water-closet and bath-room, he would have seen its filthy condition, and he would have seen also that the room could not be kept clean without the urinal. But the inspections of Saturday were the most perfect sham and farce I have ever known. The three doctors would come, for instance, into this building. They would pass through the entry down-stairs into ward No. 1 at one door, go directly through, pass out of the back door, go up the back stairway, come into ward No. 2 by the back entrance, pass directly through, make their exit at this front door and go directly down-stairs without ever going near the bath-room and water-closet.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You tell what you know now?—A. I have seen it over and over again.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You say they never made any inspection of the water-closets?—A. I have seen them and they never did. I have stationed myself in this

entry, here, for the express purpose of seeing whether they did or not, and until these charges were filed I never saw them go into the water-closet—never.

Q. Is there any other subject you wish to speak of?—A. Yes, sir; I wish to speak about some other subjects. I wish to speak about the improvements that have been made here recently, and that have been made in consequence of the charges and this investigation. I have jotted down hastily the improvements that have been recently introduced, and I mean to tell you, gentlemen, that the hospital to-day is no more like in its condition, and in the treatment of its patients, what it was prior to the filing of these charges than it is like the poorest almshouse in the country.

Q. You can state from your own knowledge.—A. I should like to refresh my memory.

Mr. SARGENT. File the document if you wish and we will print it.

The WITNESS. Very well. (Reading :) “Improvements recently made in the Freedmen’s Hospital through the exposure of abuses and demand for reforms made by patients.”

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Is that your own writing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you go into matters in detail?—A. I do. I should like to read this.

Mr. SARGENT. We will put it right in.

Mr. EATON. And have it printed.

The WITNESS. Then you do not desire that I should read it?

Mr. SARGENT. It is not necessary, for we want to take the testimony with rapidity.

The WITNESS. Very well.

The paper is as follows :

Improvements recently made in the Freedmen’s Hospital through the exposure of abuses and demands for reforms made by patients.

First. The food at present supplied the patients is of better quality, more abundant, and better cooked than formerly, although it is not even now fit for invalids.

Second. New mattresses, pillows, blankets, bed-spreads, chairs, dining-table, patients’ utensils, and electrical machine have recently been supplied, and painting been done in the bath-rooms and water-closets.

Third. Stationary urinals have been stationed in the water-closets of the male wards, where they were never placed before, and without which the water-closets cannot be kept clean, but are unfit for use and so offensive to the senses as to become insufferable nuisances, detrimental to the health and comfort of the patients.

Fourth. The medical treatment of the patients has been vastly improved, greater interest is evinced for the patients, and they are treated with greater respect than formerly, and the attending physicians now labor to promote their welfare and restore them to health, which was not the case prior to the late investigation.

Fifth. Clothing is much more freely distributed to the patients than heretofore, and the patients are now for the most part decently clad, in marked contrast to their former dirty and ragged appearance.

Sixth. The students’ table has been substantially broken up, and instead of eleven students being fed out of the hospital appropriation, as was the case during the last session of the Howard Medical College, only a few medical students are now boarded at the hospital, and they, it is claimed, work for their board.

Seventh. The practice of using the dead bodies of patients as subjects for dissection in the Howard Medical College has been substantially, if not wholly, broken up, and the burial of human remains in the hospital-yard has been discontinued since complaint of this outrage was made to the police authorities, and they exhumed a human corpse in the hospital inclosure near the wards.

Eighth. The condition of the wards and the apparel of the patients have lately been so much improved, that persons visiting the hospital at the present time could form no correct idea of its condition and the treatment of its inmates prior to the late investigation, while

the patients are now better fed, clad, lodged, and treated than formerly. The appropriation for the current year is \$5,000 less than for last year, and the medical corps ought to explain what became of that surplus money. Dr. Palmer emphatically asserted publicly to the patients that he always had paid the highest market-rates for all hospital supplies, so that the present low rates of provisions cannot account for the improved condition of the hospital and the better fare supplied the patients.

The WITNESS. I have prepared another paper, which I should like also to have printed: "Improvements required to make the Freedmen's Hospital a proper sanitary institution, and which can be made within the limits of the appropriation."

Q. (By Mr. Allison.) Does that contain your own suggestions?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; we will receive that paper also.

The paper is as follows:

Improvements required to make the Freedmen's Hospital a proper sanitary institution, and which can be made within the limits of the appropriation.

First. More, better, and well-cooked food should be supplied the inmates, and the bread, meat, butter, and fish should be of much better quality than is now furnished. The supper, especially, should be improved and the patients be no longer compelled to subsist for seventeen hours on stale bread and weak tea.

Second. A constant supply of disinfectants should be provided for each ward, and the nurses should be required to decolorize the invalids' utensils which are now never purified, but are extremely offensive to sight and sense.

Third. Each sick-ward should have the exclusive services of a night nurse to attend on the invalids requiring attention during the night.

Fourth. India-rubber blankets in sufficient quantity should be provided to secure the beds and bedding from defilement by bed-ridden patients.

Fifth. Purer milk should be procured for the hospital than is now supplied, and the institution should keep its own cows, which can be done at slight expense.

Sixth. All hospital supplies should be purchased by contract as far as practicable, and on delivery should be rigidly inspected by a competent person, and if below the proper standard should be rejected.

Seventh. The mattresses and pillows should be remade by a competent upholsterer and be adapted to the comfortable use of invalids, and be so fabricated as to prevent the production of bed-sore on their occupants.

Eighth. The hospital should forthwith and wholly be dis severed from any connection with the Howard Medical College, and be conducted as an independent government institution. Especially should the dead bodies of patients be no longer supplied the Medical College as subjects for dissection, nor be buried in the hospital-yard.

Ninth. Medical students and inexperienced persons should not henceforth be employed in the hospital dispensary to compound medicines for the patients, which requires practical skill and experience.

Tenth. Patients afflicted with infectious or loathsome diseases or pulmonary complaints should be isolated from the rest in some of the numerous apartments which are in the hospital buildings, and which are now used for the most part by persons comparatively or wholly well.

Eleventh. Curtains should be put up at all the ward-windows to protect invalids from the glare of the sun and shut out draughts of cold air, which endanger the health of the patients.

Twelfth. Lunatics, idiots, blind persons, paupers, and children of sufficient age, should be immediately sent away from the hospital to such institutions as are especially designed for the reception and care of persons of their respective classes.

Thirteenth. Better clothing should be given the patients, who should be comfortably and cleanly clad.

Fourteenth. Efficient means should be employed to exterminate the vermin that infest the wards and the bodies and clothing of inmates, who now suffer severely from these pests.

Fifteenth. The physicians should exercise a careful supervision of the nurses, for which purpose they should visit the wards several times daily and inspect their condition.

Sixteenth. Utensils and appliances required by the invalids should be provided in larger quantity and of better quality than at present.

Seventeenth. The floors of the wards should be waxed, as is the case in well-regulated hospitals, instead of being scrubbed twice a week and drenched with water, which practice is especially detrimental to the inmates, who become suddenly chilled by stepping from warm beds on to damp floors, which is liable to produce chills and fevers and aggravate their existing diseases.

Eighteenth. All reasonable means should be used to secure the comfort, safety, and wel-

fare of the patients, and promote their convalescence. Especially should they be treated with respect and consideration by the managers and employes as being the beneficiaries of the American people, and not be stigmatized as paupers or irresponsible persons, as has been the custom heretofore.

Thus improved, the hospital would become a sanitary home for the sick and homeless, a credit to the spirit of humanity that actuates our countrymen, and an honor to the nation.

The sum of eighteen thousand dollars is appropriated for subsistence for the current year, and a separate appropriation is made for fuel, and another for cooks to prepare the food for the table. These funds are ample to provide excellent meals for all the inmates of the institution, and experienced caterers assert that it does not cost so much to feed an equal number of guests at a first-class hotel.

The meals even now supplied the ward patients are, at least, very indifferent in quality and poorly cooked, while the meals served the mess-room patients are barely sufficient to support life, and do not exceed in cost nine cents per capita a day, as is susceptible of conclusive proof.

Dr. Palmer, in his last report on the hospital, asserts that the appropriation for the current year of "\$2,500 for medicines and medical supplies is 50 per cent. above the amount ever used for that purpose," whence it appears that there is no justification whatever for his failure to provide all utensils and appliances requisite for the care and treatment of medical and surgical cases.

Eighteenth. A competent person should be appointed as chaplain, who would properly attend to his duties, else the office of chaplain should be abolished as a mere sinecure. Under present arrangements, two students of the theological school of Howard University are nominally chaplain and assistant chaplain. Neither of them has ever visited ward No. 1 or 2 more than once during their term of office—neither of them has visited the sick in those wards or administered religious instruction or consolation to the dying, nor written letters for any of those patients, or performed any service whatever for them. The only duty they perform consists of a short service in the chapel twice a week in the presence of a few persons. These theological students are manifestly employed for the purpose of affording them the means of support out of the hospital appropriation while they are acquiring their profession at the Howard University.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do these documents cover the ground you wish to go over?—A. No; there are a number of other matters I should like to refer to. I want to say that there was a very great abuse, which we have exposed, and which I hope is remedied, and that is the bringing of corpses and bringing human fragments from the dissecting-room of the college and burying them here in the hospital-yard in dangerous proximity to the wards. That has been done, and the police authorities of the city—

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Wait. Have you seen that done?—A. I have seen them exhumed.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Did you see exhumed?—A. No; let me say, gentlemen—

Mr. EATON. Wait one moment. My attention was directed to this yesterday by the Secretary of the Interior, and, therefore, I want to know if you have seen it, not if you have heard it.—A. I want to say this, that I made the complaint to the police authorities. In regard to that I will give the name of Lieutenant Johnson of the police, the lieutenant of this district, and Mr. John Calvert, who can give you information on that subject, and Wesley Lucas also. Those three witnesses I should like to have examined. Calvert is the engineer; Lucas is connected with the hospital.

Q. (By Mr. EATON.) Was not Mr. Patterson, the coroner, here?—A. I would not give him.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Why not? He was here.—A. He was here. Well, I was not satisfied with his action. I thought he wanted to cover up the transaction as well as to cover up the body.

Q. Was there any body found?—A. Yes, sir; so I understood.

Q. A whole body?—A. I was not there.

Q. But you understand that a whole body was found?—A. I understand; but this is not testimony.

Q. Do you understand that there was a whole body and that there was more than a single instance, and that it was anything more than a fragment left by a student for the purpose of macerating it?—A. I shall be very happy to give my understanding, although I do not consider it more than hearsay.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. It may lead us.—A. I should like to give you the information. I understand that when Lieutenant Johnson—

By Mr. EATON:

Q. From whom do you understand?—A. From Mr. John J. Calvert, from Mr. Robert T. Johnson, from Mr. Daniel Potter.

Q. Who is Robert T. Johnson?—A. The man in here.

Q. He was not there, was he?—A. He told me he was there when the body was exhumed. So he told me. He came right in here and told me. I will give you then the statement. The statement made to me was that a human body in a state of green putrefaction was found in almost an entirely new sack out here by the dead-house; that it was dug up by Charles Banks, the janitor of the Medical College building, by command of Lieutenant Johnson; that Dr. Palmer, the coroner, the health-officer, Lieutenant Johnson, and another police-officer, with the engineer and some patients, were present; that the body was terribly offensive and had evidently been recently buried; that both feet were cut off, and that the upper part of the body or head was slashed; that Lieutenant Johnson ordered the body to be covered up with dirt and said he would attend to the matter; that that night the body was exhumed by Charles Banks and carried into the hospital dead-house; and that the next day Charles Banks, with assistants, dug over several spots here in the hospital-yard and found a very large number of bones, which also were carried into the dead-house. I am simply giving you the statement made to me at the time.

Q. By Johnson?—A. No, sir; by the engineer, Mr. Calvert, and by Mr. Potter. Mr. Johnson told me about the finding of the body.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Lieutenant Johnson?—A. No; Robert T. Johnson.

Q. Lieutenant Johnson knows about this thing and you give him as a witness?—A. The witnesses I give you are Lieutenant Johnson, of the police, John J. Calvert, the engineer, Wesley Lucas, Robert T. Johnson, and Daniel Potter.

Q. Who is Daniel Potter?—A. A patient here.

Q. In which ward?—A. In Hurd's ward, if I am not mistaken.

Q. What number?—A. I do not know the number. It is in the building near here.

Now, I do not think of anything else, gentlemen, but if you have any questions to ask, I shall answer them.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Were you present at the time when any bodies were dug up in the hospital-yard?—A. I was.

Q. Where was that; at what place on the premises?—A. Right over

there (pointing southward through a window), between here and the next building, in that yard.

Q. What was dug up?—A. A corpse.

Q. A whole corpse?—A. I do not say it was a whole corpse; but I saw the head and chest part of it, and I am satisfied I saw down to the lungs. It stank, and I turned around and walked away.

Q. What was it in?—A. In a bag.

Q. A whole head and breast?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A whole body?—A. I saw the head and breast, as I have said. The man who was digging it up had buried it, and he seemed to be digging it up so as to separate the head from the body.

Q. Who was that man?—A. Charles Banks. The police lieutenant said to him, "You are cutting the head off; do not do that." He told him to take it up the way he put it in. The lieutenant said, "You know where you put it, and you must dig it up as you put it in, and I am going to stay here if it takes all night." He did dig along until he got it.

Q. Who is Charles Banks?—A. A man who works over in the hospital department. He dug and got this head. Somebody said to the lieutenant, "That man has got the head off it, and he will not cover it."

Q. If it was in a bag how could the head be separated?—A. It was not sewed up in the bag; the bag had been simply put around it. I know part of it was inclosed and the other part was not inclosed. When I first saw the head Banks was digging down between it and the body. The lieutenant said, "You are cutting the head off; you are standing over the body; get off it." The man stepped aside, and went on digging until the bag commenced coming up. The lieutenant said, "Take it up." It was only a short distance below the ground. He just pulled it right up. I looked at it; it smelt very bad, and I turned off and walked away.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Did you see the arms?—A. I am not sure about that. I am sure I saw the head and chest and part of the legs, but am not sure that I saw the arms. I did not see the legs down to the feet.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you know of any other such case?—A. No; I did not want to see any more.

Q. Do you know of any other being there yourself?—A. I did not go to see any more.

Q. You do not know of any more?—A. I did not see any more. They dug up some, I believe, but I did not go to look at them. That was enough for me.

Q. What man told you of more?—A. The man who buried them there.

Q. Who was the man that buried them there?—A. I do not remember his name.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Was it Wesley Lucas?—A. That is the man. Other men told me they saw bodies dug up and a whole parcel of bones besides.

THURSDAY, *February 14, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

Dr. D. C. PATTERSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What office do you hold in the District of Columbia?—Answer. Coroner of the District of Columbia.

Q. How long have you been coroner?—A. Since 1872.

Q. Do you remember being called in an official capacity to the Freedmen's Hospital to examine with reference to some human remains exhumed there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State all about it.—A. It was on or about the 16th of November, 1877; I have some pencil notes taken at the time. I was summoned by Lieutenant Johnson to call at the station-house. I did so, and there I found a letter from a Mr. Felton of the Freedmen's Hospital, in which he stated that some human remains had been buried near the ward, as I understood from the letter, in which he was, and that it was offensive and that there were possible suspicions of foul play—at all events that the matter needed investigation, and stated that a man employed at the hospital by the name of Banks could give me information in regard to it.

Q. Have you that letter now?—A. I have not. It was a letter directed to Lieutenant Johnson, and he kept it, I believe.

[Lieutenant Johnson produced a letter which was handed to and examined by the subcommittee.]

Q. Is this the letter [handing the letter to the witness]?—A. [After examining.] I should think it was.

Q. Just read the letter.—A. It is in these words:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL, *Nov. 15, 1877.*

Lieutenant JOHNSON,
Metropolitan Police.

SIR: I hereby complain of the recent burials of human remains on the hospital premises in dangerous proximity to the ward of which I am an inmate, and which has created a nuisance prejudicial to life and health. These burials have been made without the requisite permits and are consequently unlawful, and the offenders are liable to criminal presentation and punishment. These interments, moreover, are attended with such suspicions of foul play as to imperatively demand investigation to determine whether a homicide has been committed, the name of the victim, and the perpetrators of the crime, who ought to be forthwith arrested and brought to trial.

I will give you all requisite particulars to enable you to disinter the remains if you will call on me at ward No. 2 at the hospital.

Yours,

FRANKLIN E. FELTON.

I was under the impression at the time that in the letter Mr. Banks' name was given, but that, I presume, I learned at the hospital afterward. I found Mr. Banks, who was an employé of the hospital, and he said that something like a year before he had been asked to bury some bones for a medical student, and that he had done so in that vicinity; that that morning or the morning before, perhaps the morning before, just before daylight, he attempted to dig up those bones, but light coming on, the attention of the people from the ward was attracted, and he was not able to find them at once, and abandoned it. We then set him to digging, and very soon he disinterred these remains. There was a head, a spinal column, a thorax, and a pelvis of a human being, the integument and muscles all removed, and nothing but bone left, except such small particles of muscular matter as were left from the dissecting.

Supposing at the time, as I now suppose, that they were the work of the medical students, and had been buried there for the purpose of cleaning the bones, I took no further action in the matter. They were turned over to the health-officer for burial, or such disposal as he thought necessary, and the health-officer, if my memory serves me, at that time ordered them to left in the dead-house until he reported the matter to the Board of Health.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Who was the health-officer ?—A. Dr. Keene.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is that the ordinary method of cleaning a skeleton to be preserved by students ?—A. Yes, sir. That is the ordinary method, perhaps, where they are not in the immediate vicinity of water. They are frequently sunk in water in a box and macerated there.

Q. How far below the surface was this part of the skeleton ?—A. I should think not more than a foot. It was inclosed in a sack ; but not more than a foot or eighteen inches from the surface at the outside.

Q. Was there any offensive smell ?—A. There was no offensive odor from these bones. I did not get down to examine them closely ; but standing near, there was no odor from them.

Q. Were any other bones found ?—A. No, sir ; none except these. The way I accounted for a portion of a skeleton being there was that it is the custom of medical students in their dissections to dissect by classes of four or five in a class. They usually cast lots for the different portions of the subject for dissection, sometimes one drawing an arm and another a leg, &c., and when they get through it they divide these remains among them.

Q. For what purpose do they preserve them ?—A. For purposes of study afterwards. I think almost all medical students, if they can, preserve a skeleton when they are young and enthusiastic on the subject of bones.

Q. Did you make any report upon the matter ?—A. No, sir. I made these notes, but no report except these at the time [exhibiting memoranda]. They are in pencil. I do not know that you can read them. They are not signed either. [Handing paper memoranda.]

Q. Have you any objection to these notes going into the record ?—A. Not if they are legible enough so that the committee can read them.

Q. The paper is in a very good hand and well written. You can read it ?—A. It is—

NOVEMBER 16, 1877.

This afternoon, in compliance with a notice through Lieutenant Johnson, I called at the second precinct station-house, when the lieutenant showed me a letter from Mr. Felton, in which he charged that a human body had been privately buried near the hospital, and that Charles Banks—

I do not understand how I mixed up Charles Banks there. My attention must have been called to him by the lieutenant or some one at the time—

could give information concerning it. I immediately proceeded to investigate the matter. Finding Banks, I was informed that about a year before he had, at the request of a medical student, buried some bones near the dead-house ; that the student had lately "asked him to dig them up for her" ;—

I remember that he said it was a female student that owned them—

that this morning before light he had proceeded to the place to do so, dug a little while, but did not find them. Daylight coming on he was obliged to suspend operations, because of their discovery by some of the patients in the ward. Banks was then put to work and

soon exhumed a sack in which was the head and thorax of a human being, the soft parts having been removed. The legs and arms were wanting to complete the skeleton. There was no offensive odor from the bones, which were turned over to the health-officer, and then placed in the dead-house to await the action of the Board of Health. It was believed that these bones were buried for the purpose of cleaning them from the little bits of muscle after dissection. No inquest was deemed necessary.

Q. Do you know what is the process of burials in the case of death occurring at the hospital?—A. I was one of the physicians in attendance at that hospital several years ago. At that time the permit was obtained the same as it is now.

Q. Obtained from whom?—A. From the board of health, and the interments were made just as they are now.

Q. Is that still done?—A. I suppose it is. I have not had anything to do with the hospital for some years.

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make in reference to the matter?—A. No, sir.

Dr. P. T. KEENE sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What position do you hold under the District government?—
Answer. Health officer of the District of Columbia.

Q. How long have you been such?—A. Four years.

Q. Were you in November last at the Freedmen's Hospital in connection with the incident related by the previous witness?—A. I was.

Q. State all you know of the matter.—A. I have brought me with a communication bearing upon the subject, which was addressed by Franklin E. Felton to Lieutenant Johnson of the Metropolitan police.

Q. The same one which has been read here?—A. I was not present when that was read. That was referred by the lieutenant to me. It seems to be a copy (examining). I see, by looking at it, it is a copy of the same communication. This was referred to me personally by the lieutenant of police, who came to see me in relation to it, and I went with him or went out almost immediately to the place indicated by Mr. Felton, and met there Lieutenant Johnson and the coroner, Dr. Patterson, and we, after inquiring of Mr. Felton as to the nature of the complaint in regard to the burying of bodies, found this man Banks, who had charge of the dissecting-room as we understood, and after questioning him pretty closely, we were led to believe that some bones had been buried in a locality very near the dead-house, I think it was, and, after some persuasion, he was induced to commence digging at that locality, and succeeded in finding a bag containing some bones, a portion of a human body, which had been buried. My jurisdiction over the matter extended to the discovery whether there was a nuisance injurious to health on the premises. I found that the bones were not offensive, and for that reason took no official action, except that I referred the communication which was addressed to me to the board of health, in this language :

Respectfully referred to the honorable board of health for action as to any transgression of the regulations governing vital statistics. The question of nuisance injurious to health I will personally investigate and report upon.

This communication was referred by the board to the registrar of vital statistics, who has charge of the granting of permits for the burial of bodies.

Q. What is his name?—A. Dr. D. W. Bliss. When a person dies within the limits of the District of Columbia, a reputable physician certifies to the cause of death on a given blank. That certificate is brought

to the register of vital statistics, and upon it is issued a permit which entitles the body to enter the cemetery; and no body can be buried in any cemetery in the District of Columbia without such a permit. The register referred the communication "to G. S. Palmer, M. D., surgeon in charge of Freedmen's Hospital for report," and he returned it with this report:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL,
Washington, November 23, 1877.

Respectfully returned to the honorable registrar, board of health, with a statement that no human bodies have ever been buried in the grounds of this hospital. After careful investigation, I found that some bones, parts of skeletons, had been placed in the grounds last year, without my knowledge, by some medical students for the purpose of cleaning them. The bodies from which these bones were detached were buried under legal and proper permission from the board of health. The bones are all removed. No effluvia or nuisance connected with them has ever existed.

G. S. PALMER,
Surgeon in charge."

Q. Did you find any effluvia or anything dangerous to health in the deposit which you found there?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are a doctor yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know anything about the habit of medical students in regard to the acquisition of skeletons and preserving them or cleaning them?—A. I know that they are very anxious always to get possession of bones, and sometimes keep them detached, at other times wire them together into a skeleton, for study.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. It is necessary that a certain process, either by water or the earth, should be gone through, I suppose, in order to macerate them?—A. Yes, sir; in order to free them entirely of the portions of muscle and tissue that attach to them. There are different processes. Some quicker process might be resorted to.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Were these bones probably what were left after a proper dissection?—A. They appeared to be so.

Q. Have you stated what the bones consisted of that you saw there?—A. There were the bones of the trunk, as far as I remember, with a portion of the head. I think the top part of the head, the skull, had been taken off. There was the lower portion of the skull, I think, with the bones of the trunk.

Q. Is the top part of the head taken off sometimes in the process of dissection?—A. Yes, sir; in order to take out the brain; sawed longitudinally.

Q. There was no suspicion of foul play in that case so far as anything you saw indicated?—A. No, sir.

JAMES JOHNSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What office do you hold under the District government?—Answer. I am lieutenant of the Metropolitan police.

Q. How long have you been acting in that capacity?—A. Since 1861.

Q. You are the officer referred to by the previous witness as having received a communication from Mr. Felton?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you present at the time these bones were dug up?—A. I was.

Q. State what you saw there.—A. The bag was dug up by the man spoken of. After the complaint of that letter now by your side, attention was called to it. On taking the letter to Major Richards, my superior officer, he ordered me to go after the coroner and health officer, take them there and see what it was. I did so; I took them there, caused the bag to be dug up, and found the remains of the dissecting-room. Not being a practical man in such things, I cannot tell you much about that.

Q. Did you notice whether there was any effluvia or smell about it?—A. There was considerable to me. I, perhaps, was at the windward where the wind blew to me. The doctors kept on the other side.

Q. Was there much flesh upon the bones?—A. No; I do not think it was flesh, but there was some matter, I think; I did not examine very closely. I thought my part was done when I handed it to the proper officer.

Q. Did Mr. Banks show any reluctance to digging it up?—A. He did. He did not appear to want to dig at the place first. I had to go and put my foot on the place where it was, and finally he did dig it up.

Q. Do you know what position Mr. Banks held at the hospital?—A. I cannot say, only what he said himself. When I first saw Mr. Banks I spoke to him and asked him where the place of this burial was. He took me around four or five places and showed me where they had been burying. They had been burying there for some time, he said. We did not undo any but one.

Q. Did he say at whose request he buried this piece of skeleton?—A. I did not ask him.

Q. What was in the sack?—A. There were portions of a human body; I did not examine closely and cannot tell you how much. I remember seeing a head sawed around (indicating), part of it off, part of the lower part, I think, but really I cannot tell you because I did not take much notice of it.

A. Did you observe whether there was a trunk or not?—A. I did not particularly; it was a bag quite full.

Q. Was the bag tied up wrapped?—A. Tied up, so that the pick tore it open.

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make about it?—A. None, sir; further than that the chief doctor there said he did not know they were buried; he would have them all attended to to-morrow, and everything should be cleared up; all the places dug up that were said to have anything, and he would have it all attended to.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Has any other complaint been made to your quarters since?—A. No particular complaint; only rumors.

CHARLES BANKS sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you connected with the Howard University or the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer. The Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. For how long have you been?—A. For a little over eight years.

Q. Did you bury the bones to which reference has been made by the previous witness?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At whose request?—A. Mr. Stagg's.

Q. Who is Mr. Stagg?—A. A white student there. There he is, right over there. [Pointing to a person.]

Q. A white student of the university?—A. He is a medical student.

Q. At what time did you bury them?—A. I do not recollect exactly what time it was; that is, the day; but it was some time last winter. I cannot recollect exactly what date it was.

Q. When they were dug up in November, then, they had been there about three-quarters of a year?—A. Those were buried there in the course of lectures before this; so you can judge yourself. I do not recollect the exact date.

Q. Did Dr. Palmer, or any doctor of the institution, know of their being buried there?—A. No, sir; Dr. Palmer did not know anything about it.

Q. Did any other doctor of the institution?—A. No, sir; I do not believe any one but the gentleman who got me to put them down for him. He did not tell me to bury them. He asked me to clean them for him; so I put them down there.

Q. What were the remains?—A. The trunk part of a subject, with the lower part of the skull attached to it. The top part was off.

Q. You took that method of cleaning them?—A. Yes, sir; I took them to clean for him.

Q. What was your position at the hospital?—A. Working around there, keeping the grounds clean; almost anything that comes to hand like work; attending to the store-rooms; first one thing and then another.

Q. Was there flesh on these bones at the time you buried them?—A. Yes, sir; there was some little flesh on them.

Q. How deep did you bury them?—A. When I put them down there, I put them about two feet; perhaps a little more when I first put them down there.

Q. Did you take them up afterward, before this time?—A. I went to work there to try to get them up; and I made a trial of it before that, before this report, and I was not successful in getting them.

Q. Why not?—A. I could not find them. They were watching me, so that I did not get them. I did not care about any one seeing me, to raise any excitement around, as of course I thought it might. The student told me that he wanted them; and so this time I went to get them, and it was about the same thing; I saw them watching me and I could not get at them. Now, mind, there is one thing I should have explained about this thing to the health-officer, which I think I had better mention here. I had found these, and the parties were watching me so close I did not get at them, and I just covered them right over again. I did not take them out, because I did not care about them seeing me. I commenced at it just before daylight, and had a little trouble about finding it.

Q. You had forgotten just where you put it?—A. Yes, sir; I did not strike the place exactly.

Q. Have you buried any bones there since?—A. No, sir.

Q. Had you buried any before?—A. I had a few more buried at the same time, but not any before or since.

Q. What had you buried at the same time?—A. I buried some few bones for a lady by the name of Mrs. Hillyer. She was a student there.

Q. What were the bones you buried for her?—A. Those were the ones I have taken up since.

Q. What were those bones you buried for her?—A. I do not know the names of the bones exactly.

Q. Arms, or legs, or what?—A. Some parts of the arm, I think—not many.

Q. Was that all?—A. Yes, sir, that was all.

S. F. STAGG sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a student at the Howard Medical College?—
Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you the person referred to by Mr. Banks?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State what you know with reference to the bones buried at the Freedmen's Hospital grounds; how they came to be buried, and who knew about it.—A. There were some bones I wanted cleaned, and I asked him to clean them. I do not know that any one knew it except Mr. Banks. I knew nothing about their being buried there. I knew they were buried, but I did not know where.

Q. How did you obtain these bones?—A. From the dissecting-room. They were some of my dissections, partly.

Q. How thoroughly had the flesh been cleaned from these bones?—
A. Nothing but ligaments were attached to the bones, and attachments of muscles. The muscles were removed, as they are generally, in the dissecting-room.

Q. What was your object in having these cleaned or buried?—A. Because I wanted to preserve them for study.

Q. Did you have leave from any of the officers of the institution?—A. No, sir.

Q. You say they knew nothing about it?—A. They knew nothing about it.

Q. Had you ever had any others buried there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or do you know of any others having been buried there?—A. No, sir.

Q. What were the bones?—A. They were the lower part of a skull, a spinal column, and ribs, and pelvis.

Q. Were you there when they were dug up?—A. No, sir; I was at the college. I was not present on the grounds at the time.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. It seems that these remains were disinterred in November. Do you know when you caused them to be buried? I understood you to say you did not know where they were buried; but did you know the time, about how long they had been in the ground?—A. I do not know when they were buried, but I asked Mr. Banks to clean some bones for me about the 1st of December, 1876.

Q. Then they had been there nearly a year as you suppose; that is, you had given them to him nearly a year before?—A. It was a year before that I asked Mr. Banks to clean them for me.

Q. You did not know that they were placed there?—A. I did not know where they were. I only knew they were in his hands for cleaning.

Q. Had you before this dissected any remains, and were you made somewhat familiar with the process of dissection?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were they as thoroughly cleaned as they could be in the dissecting room or as they would be?—A. As thoroughly as they are generally. They could be cleaned more, of course.

Q. Were they cleaned as usually is the case?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were not there when they were exhumed?—A. No, sir.

J. B. JOHNSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. EATON:

Question. What is your position?—Answer. I hold the office of secretary and the office of treasurer of the Howard University.

Q. Will you state the value of the property which belongs to the university that the Freedmen's Hospital occupies, treating it separately from the university proper?—A. Yes, sir. At Dr. Palmer's request I looked the matter up, and I put it in the form of a communication.

Q. Suppose you read that communication.—A. It is addressed to the chairman of this committee.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1878.

Hon. A. A. SARGENT,
Chairman of Committee on Freedmen's Hospital:

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following statement pertaining to the cost of the Freedmen's Hospital owned by this university, now occupied by the United States.

There are, in addition to the main brick hospital building, four (4) frame two-story ward buildings, one engine-house, one laundry, one mess-house, one kitchen, and three outhouses, dead-house, &c.

From the books of this office I find that the cost of the buildings and appurtenances was \$164,861.42, made up of items as follows, in 1863, 1869, and January and February, 1870:

H. R. Searle, architect	\$3, 125 50
Evans & Entwisle, contractors	18, 700 00
Evans & Entwisle, contractors	48, 900 00
A. R. Shepherd & Bro., plumbers, for plumbing, steam fitting, &c	15, 853 06
The next entry charged to these buildings is for ten items for work on ward-buildings, material used in fitting up wards, engine-house, laundry, and main building, plumbing, introducing water and gas, furnishing and fitting furnaces, labor-hire, plastering, painting, and grading grounds	72, 299 04
Thomas Evans (plumber and gas-fitter) and others, sundry bills	5, 993 82
Total	164, 861 42

The grounds comprise about 150,000 square feet, valued in 1872 at 40 cents per square foot.

I put 1872 in because the difference between valuations at that time and this is considerable, and the cost of the buildings was at that time.

Of this the university owns 102,000 square feet, on which the buildings (except 2 wards) stand.

This portion is valued at about 20 cents per square foot now, making about.. \$20, 400 00

That portion of the grounds on which the two west ward buildings stand is held by the university by lease, and is valued at about \$8,000 or \$10,000, making the present value of the land used by the United States, about..... \$28, 000 00

That is about one-half what it was valued at in 1872.

Add to this the cost of the improvements herein given..... 164, 861 42

Gives a total of 192, 861 42
Respectfully,

J. B. JOHNSON,
Secretary and Treasurer Howard University.

Q. That gives the cost of the building built when prices were very high. What I wanted was an examination made as to the value of the buildings now, in their present condition, with the shrinkage of values, as there has been a very great shrinkage in the last few years. You have approximated to it so far as the land is concerned, and reduced that from 40 cents to 20 cents a foot. Now, in regard to the buildings.—A. I should suppose the value of the buildings alone, including all the fixtures, plumbing, pipe, &c., to be \$100,000 in these times. The executive committee, under whose direction I operate, have once or twice thought of putting a deed of trust on that property for the purpose of paying a small debt which is part due, and have estimated that property at that figure within the last year for that purpose.

Q. Then your best estimate would be that the property with the buildings is worth to-day \$125,000?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Taking all the shrinkage into consideration?—A. Yes, sir; I should say it was worth that.

FRIDAY, *February 22, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the Freedmen's Hospital.

DANIEL POTTER (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT.

Q. Where were you born?—A. Near London, England.

Q. How long have you been in this country?—A. Seven and a half years.

Q. Are you a naturalized citizen?—A. I am not.

Q. Where have you lived since you have been here?—A. Four years in Troy, six months in Philadelphia, and the rest here.

Q. How long have you been in this hospital?—A. Since the 19th of May last.

Q. What hospital had you been in previously?—A. I was in Providence Hospital three weeks. Through the kind auspices of Lady Thorn-ton I went there when I was first sick.

Q. Did you come to this hospital from there?—A. No, sir; I left there because I thought I was able to leave the hospital and I had work in this city. I thought I was able to accomplish that work; but during the three weeks previous to coming here I had a relapse.

Q. Where were you at work?—A. Then I was at work on K street in a place called the Hamilton House, a boarding-house, doing some upholstering-work. Previous to that I worked for W. B. Moses.

Q. How long did you work for Moses?—A. I worked for him in all about four months, probably five months.

Q. Is that your letter? (Handing to the witness the following letter:)

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL,
February 18, 1878.

GENTLEMEN: I hereby charge that, on Thursday, the 14th instant, a prominent witness, one Charles Banks, committed perjury in the testimony given by him before your committee in exculpation of the surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, by imposing on you fiction instead of truth, concerning the burial of human remains on the hospital premises.

Such mendacity furnishes a parallel in turpitude to the fabricated testimony and spurious affidavits lately foisted on the Hon. Secretary of the Interior, with intent to deceive him as to the management of the hospital which is under his jurisdiction, and for whose proper administration he is accountable.

If accorded a hearing before your committee I will substantiate my averment by credible witnesses, and prove that human remains and offal from the dissecting-rooms of the Howard Medical College have been inhumed in large quantity at different times, and in different parts of the hospital inclosure, for actual sepulture and not for the sole purpose of "maceration" for the benefit of certain medical students, as is now pretended, but which pretense can be demonstrated by irrefutable evidence to be a mere subterfuge.

Respectfully submitted.

DANIEL POTTER.

Hons. A. A. SARGENT, W. B. ALLISON, and W. W. EATON,
Senate Subcommittee to investigate the Freedmen's Hospital.

A. Yes, sir; that is my letter.

Q. Can you make any statement of your own knowledge in reference to the facts there referred to; for instance, in reference to the burial of bodies?—A. On the 16th of November last I was a witness to the taking up of a body at the dead-house. The body apparently had no arms, but the flesh was on it.

Q. Is that the body referred to by the coroner and others?—A. Yes, sir; and it smelt very badly, insomuch that everybody had to draw away when the body was exposed. Then Lieutenant Johnson after some little time directed it to be buried. It was about a few hours;

but that same night it was taken up and carried into the dead-house. On the following day Dr. Purvis and two or three men for five or six hours were taking up refuse and bones. That also was carried to the dead-house.

Q. Were you there?—A. Yes, sir; and saw it all.

Q. How many bodies did they take up?—A. There were five different places that they took the remains out of.

Q. What were these remains?—A. These were bones that were put into a bag and carried into the dead-house.

Q. Can you describe the bones?—A. I cannot minutely describe them; that is, I did not examine them, but they were evidently human bones, taken up all the way along by the side of the dead-house.

Q. How many of these bones were there?—A. A fair average cart-load; that is to say, in other words, four to five good wheelbarrows full. Dr. Palmer sat in the engine-house.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Looking on, do you mean?—A. Looking on.

Q. Who else was present beside yourself, Dr. Palmer, and Dr. Purvis?—A. Lots.

Q. Name them.—A. The most prominent was Calvert, the engineer; and a man named White; he also saw it. I believe a man named Strader. These are men now here. There were several men who saw it; but Dr. Palmer ordered the rails to be taken away that the men were sitting on.

Q. Where is White?—A. He is here in the hospital.

Q. Which ward?—A. Chase's ward, I think. I remember seeing him and Strader.

Q. Who is Strader?—A. He is also in Chase's ward. I remember these among them. There were probably twenty patients around. A rail ran along there, and Dr. Palmer had that taken up, so that they could not sit around, and so they distributed themselves. Dr. Palmer called me into the engine-house and had a conversation with me.

Q. Were there any whole bodies taken up at that time?—A. Not whole bodies.

Q. What were they—arms, or legs, or what?—A. There were arms and legs; that is, I presume they were; they were pieces.

Q. Pieces of bodies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say in your letter that they were not put in for purposes of maceration?—A. They were offal from the dissecting-room.

Q. These bones?—A. The refuse was. A great deal of it had been buried out there, which a man named Wesley Lucas has been paid for so doing.

Q. Did you see him paid for it?—A. I did not see him paid for it.

Q. How do you know it?—A. I know it because he was promised \$3, and he made application.

Q. How do you know that?—A. By his own statement.

Q. It is not necessary for you to state anything except what you know. We can call him for that.—A. Exactly.

Q. Have you any other statement to make in regard to it?—A. Nothing in regard to that.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You speak of legs and arms. Did you see the hands and feet?—A. No; I did not see the hands and feet.

Q. What did you see that makes you know that a particular bone was an arm?—A. From the general appearance of them.

Q. Of the bones?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any flesh on them?—A. There was flesh on some of them.

Q. On what?—A. On some of the bones that were taken up. There was also soft matter put into sacks and carried into the dead-house; that is, when they came to a place where they were, they were gathered up, shoveled into the bags, and then carried into the dead-house. Dr. Palmer, in conversation at that time in the engine-house, said he was about to have all that gathered up, and that was what they were then doing, and that he should see that the parties that put it there were—I forget about the word, but the meaning was that he would see that they were punished, or something of that kind, for it.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Now make any statement you wish in reference to the hospital since last May, of your own knowledge.—A. When I entered on the 19th of May I was very sick. I was put into Dr. Purvis's ward and received the ordinary care. The bread was sour, vegetables very poor, the meat was very bad, and the sanitary condition of the hospital, and the water-closets, and everything of that kind was very bad. My bed that I slept in I made complaint to the nurse for at least three weeks that I could not sleep in it on account of bed-bugs, or chinchies.

Q. What was the name of the nurse?—A. Lucius Hawkins. I complained to him two or three times during the three weeks; then told him that if he would lend me a hand we would take it down into the yard. At the bottom of the bed was an old mattress, in a filthy condition. The mattress was literally covered with bed-bugs. I should say without the slightest exaggeration that there were thousands, and I said, "For goodness' sake, Lucius, do not let that go up into the ward again; it never ought to go anywhere." The tick was filthy, and I said, "For goodness' sake, if you will only get a straw tick and give me some straw to sleep on so that I shall be free from that vermin, I shall be satisfied," and he did so. I have killed on my pillow as many as nineteen or twenty of a night. After I became convalescent I went into the mess-room to assist around with Dr. Purvis. I concurred with him; he thought it would do me good to have exercise, and I was in that room for about three months. There I found that the patients, upwards of about one hundred, had for breakfast one slice of bread, about a pint of coffee, about two table-spoonfuls of very inferior hominy, and there was a sauce that was made and put over it that was composed of hog-fat, flour, and warm water, or something of that kind. It was so bad that the men could not eat it. That was their breakfast. Dinner would be about four ounces of meat, one potato, one slice of bread, and the meat on beef-days would be composed of tongues, hearts, and necks, and that class of meat. Supper would be one slice of bread, one mug of tea, with a very small dab of molasses. There was only one slice of bread allowed for each patient, inasmuch as there were ninety-six patients and twenty-four loaves put out for them, and that was cut into four slices a loaf.

Q. How large were the loaves?—A. They were supposed to weigh a pound, I presume; but that was the quantity. A man had a second slice of bread if there happened to be any left from the previous meal. Out of the ninety-six there might be six or eight absentees, and that would give six or eight slices for the next meal. The corn-bread was at that time excessively bad.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Was corn-bread served at the same time?—A. To a few individ-

uals that preferred corn-bread, but not with the white bread. When the whole of them were served with corn-bread, they then had a piece of corn-bread to each one, and it was of a very inferior quality; it was hard and very badly baked. There was one instance one morning of a man named Kelley—he is not here now—who asked me for a piece of white bread. I told him I had none, and the consequence was he could not have any. He took a piece of corn-bread and left the hospital and I believe took it down to the Interior Department. This sort of thing went on precisely like that until just the eve of the investigation, and Dr. Palmer, Dr. Purvis, and the others would be here alternately very early of a morning. Then there was butter introduced, and the coffee was better; and when there was not butter there was a small portion of meat for breakfast; the food was brought up to a little better standard. I believe that men can have what bread they require. When the investigation began here, the third day I was discharged from the hospital without any cause whatever. I went down to the Secretary and the Secretary sent up a messenger here with a letter. I was under Dr. Purvis for about six weeks after that, or rather until the 11th or 12th—I think the 11th—of November, and Dr. Purvis when he came around the ward asked me on that morning, which was Sunday morning, how I was, and I described to him that I had a pain in my side and generally how I felt. He made answer and said, “Yes, I will give you a dose to-morrow morning that will kill you.”

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Was any one present at that conversation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who else?—A. Johnson.

Q. What Johnson?—A. Robert Johnson was there. I do not know whether anybody else was present. He was lying in bed and could not help hearing it.

Q. Were you near Johnson's bed?—A. I was in the next bed.

Q. Who was at the next side?—A. The wall was at the next side. I was sleeping in the bed next to Johnson. I do not think there was any one at the time in that bed; I do not remember any one else being around there.

Q. How loud did he speak it?—A. About as loud as I am speaking now.

Q. So that he could be heard at half a dozen beds distant?—A. If the people were there.

Q. Were there not people in the beds?—A. No; no one except a man like Johnson, who had to lie in bed.

Q. People sit by the sides of their beds, I notice, all the time?—A. Yes, sir. I do not remember any one else who would have distinctly heard it.

Q. Do you know whether anyone heard it at all?—A. I do not know whether any one did hear it for I never made any inquiries about it.

Q. Did you inquire of Johnson?—A. No, sir. The next morning, the 12th of November, I believe, Dr. Purvis took my card and made me go out, whereupon I went down to the Secretary, mentioned the case to him, and he told me he could not interfere in any of the details of the hospital; but I was so sick that I had to go somewhere, and I made application to Dr. Bliss to give me an examination, and he carefully examined me. He gave me a certificate stating the state that I was in, and he wrote a few words to the Secretary, which I took to him and waited for an answer. The answer that the Secretary sent out to me was that he had sent to the Freedmen's Hospital and directed Dr. Palmer to take

me in. That night I came up, and Dr. Palmer told me I could not stop here, whereupon I went down the following day and acquainted the Secretary with it. He told me to still come up, and I came up here. The next night Dr. Palmer told me that he had received no information from the Secretary, but that I could stop here, have my supper, bed, and breakfast, but to get out in the morning, whereupon I did. I made application to the Secretary; I went down. He sent for me, and he told me that he had sent an order up here that I was to be taken in. I came in and went under Dr. Glennan. On Sunday morning Dr. Glennan found me very sick in bed with a relapse, and ever since then under Dr. Glennan I have been getting very much better.

Q. Is Dr. Glennan an attentive physician?—A. Yes, sir; with me.

Q. Does he take good care of you?—A. Dr. Glennan has taken very great care of me ever since.

Q. Does he take good care of the ward he has charge of?—A. It is kept in the ordinary way; that is to say, he looks after it that it is kept clean. I noticed that he mentions everything to the nurses, that is to say, if he sees anything wrong.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You say he is attentive to you as a physician?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What Senator Sargent asks is, is he attentive to the ward, to other patients?—A. Yes, sir; he is. I have no complaint; I do not know that any one has, of the ward; but every man there has a complaint, that is, if he chooses to make it, as regards the clothing, because even now we have lice on us. On the 1st of February last—this last 1st of the month—when the clean drawers were given out to me, I saw them. I, the week previously, had found some lice on me, which I pointed out to the nurse, James Hurd, and when the clean clothes came I had made up my mind that I would see, if possible, where these things could come from, because I could not conceive that in the sense of the word plainly the ward was lousy; that is, I had never seen them about, only occasionally on sheets or something of that kind, an occasional one, and I had told Hurd there must be some man or something around here, one or two of them, that must have got these things on them, or else they would not drop about. On the 1st of February, being Friday, when as usual we have our clean clothes given out, I determined to examine the drawers; that is, the drawers that were given me, and in so doing I found in those drawers four dead lice that had been killed evidently during the washing but had not been rinsed off. I took them off with a pin. They were a sort of woolen drawers; that is, cotton-woolen inside. I took them off with a pin, and called the nurse and showed them to him. I said, "Hurd, these things really come by the inattention of the washing or something of that kind, because here they are." There was another man at the same time, of the name of Lyons, who examined his, and he found a lot of nits on them. He took a poker and heated it in the stove and burnt them in the seam. The nurse said, "Well, what do you think; shall I get you any others?" I said, "I guess these are all right; I'll try them." Four days after I found two live ones on me.

Q. Were these body-lice?—A. Yes, sir; I am speaking of body-lice. He came up with the matron and obtained a new undershirt. I said, "It is no good of you bringing me down old ones; get me some new ones if they will give them to you." He brought me down a new undershirt. I do not know whether the drawers were new. However, I put on clean clothes. That has been frequently the case with several who have been in the ward and are here now.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What is the character of the patients brought into the hospital? Are they both colored and white?—A. In the ward that I am now there are only two of us white; all the rest are colored.

Q. How do they come into the hospital; in clean, nice clothes, or in a dirty condition?—A. Those that are in the hospital now, in the ward I am speaking of, have been there for years, I presume, every one of them.

Q. Have there been no deaths in that ward since you have been there?—A. Not since I have been there. One man has died that was in there; he had dropsy or something of that kind, and Dr. Glennan had him removed over to this ward, I presume, for better attention, there being a night-nurse here. He died, but there has been no deaths in my ward since last November. There has been one man died in Chase's ward.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. What number is that?—A. Ward 6.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. The persons that are in your ward, then, are not persons with deadly diseases?—A. No, sir.

Q. It might be considered one of the best wards?—A. One of the best wards; that is to say, they are all convalescents. When I say "convalescents," they are principally elderly; the majority are elderly men, and men that are crippled, probably. Two or three besides myself, now fortunately not very bad, are consumptives.

Q. Are the patients quiet and well-behaved?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your physician pays great attention to the ward, gives you kindly medical attendance, and your fare is now good?—A. The fare is very much better than it was.

Q. Have you any complaint to make of it as it is now?—A. No, sir; because I believe now anything that a man reasonably requires, if he asks for it, will be furnished him.

Q. Do you ever go out of the hospital?—A. I occasionally go out to take a walk.

Q. How often? How many times have you been out this week?—A. Once.

Q. Where did you go?—A. I went down to the city.

Q. How long were you gone?—A. An hour and a half.

Q. Do you ask leave to go, or do you go whenever you wish?—A. Whenever I wish; that is to say, the hours are up to half past eight. After the doctor has gone through we are allowed to go out any reasonable time, provided we are in here at proper time for meals. When I go out I generally go out after dinner, except it is very fine, frosty weather, when, perhaps, after the doctor has gone out, I take a walk on the hill.

Q. Are the clothes which are given to you the ones you had previously worn, or are they taken from the general stock, on Fridays, when the change is made?—A. The clothes for every ward come back to that same ward. For instance, they are all numbered as "No. 6 ward."

Q. They do not, however, come back to the same individuals?—A. Probably not, although I guess the nurse, as near as he can, does that.

Q. Do you get back generally the same clothes you had before?—A. I believe I do. I believe my undershirts are the same.

Q. And the drawers?—A. I do not think they could keep track of the

drawers, because they are all alike; but my undershirts are not the ribbed shirts. Most of the other men wear ribbed shirts, and I generally get mine back.

Q. Do you know what the process of washing here is? Do they do it by steam?—A. I believe so. I never was in the wash-room. I only imagine it is by steam because of the steam-boilers.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You say the food is satisfactory now. Is the quantity greater than before?—A. The quality is better, and the quantity is more.

Q. That is to say, instead of having twenty-four loaves of bread for ninety-six people, you have more loaves?—A. That I do not know. I have not been in the mess-room. I am speaking of the ward diet.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Is not a loaf of one pound ordinarily enough for four persons?—A. They are about that size [indicating].

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. About 8 inches?—A. I imagine so.

Q. Did they not have meat with bread?—A. There was not a piece of meat given, except at dinner.

Q. They had hominy at that time?—A. They had hominy, but it was very bad; green and musty.

Q. What else besides the hominy did you mention?—A. Nothing.

Q. They had bread and hominy only for breakfast?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was last May?—A. I was in the mess-room from June forward three months.

Q. And there was nothing for breakfast at the mess-room but what you have stated?—A. At the mess-room nothing for breakfast but bread and hominy, and one slice of bread for supper. At that time the meat was very bad. There was not such a thing—I noticed particularly that I never saw such a thing, until the secretary himself had been up here, which he came up here one day; I never saw such a thing as a whole quarter of beef come into the place until after that. They were all odds and ends; nothing further than about the shoulder.

WILLIAM BROWN (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a nurse in this hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been?—A. I guess about 12 years.

Q. What ward have you now charge of?—A. Number 1 and number 2.

Q. Are you a day-nurse or a night-nurse?—A. A night-nurse.

Q. Is there any other nurse in ward 1 or 2 besides yourself?—A. No one but me.

Q. Do you have assistance in the patients?—A. Sometimes.

Q. What do you do as a nurse for the comfort of your patients?—A. I give out the medicine, keep up the fire, and attend to whatever they want done; wait upon them at night so far as the comfort of the patients is concerned.

Q. Are you attentive in doing that?—A. I always do all I can.

Q. Do you take pains to take care of the patients?—A. I take pains to do all I can to take care of them.

Q. Do you succeed in taking care of them?—A. Well, it is too much for one man. It would take two men to do all.

Q. How long have you had charge of two wards?—A. It has been going on three years, I guess, since I have had charge of two wards.

Q. Did you have charge of two wards under Dr. Reyburn?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did Dr. Reyburn leave?—A. It was some time, I believe, in March, 1874 or 1875, I have forgotten exactly the date, but I always had another man down-stairs with me then to take charge of the lower ward, and sometimes when a man was sick in one ward and needed assistance he would detail some of the patients to help us.

Q. Have you had charge of the same wards for twelve years?—A. No, sir. When the hospital used to be over yonder at Le Droit Park I staid over there all the time pretty much since 1866. I was there working then. I only had charge of one. That was a larger ward than this.

Q. How long has the hospital been here?—A. I suppose about eight years, as near as I can come to it.

Q. Who had charge of these wards before you took them?—A. When they moved over I came over to take charge of one ward.

Q. Which ward did you take charge of?—A. Number 1.

Q. And who had charge of number 2 then?—A. Mr. Street. He is a day-nurse now.

Q. He was night-nurse then?—A. Yes, sir; he and I were both on as night-nurses.

Q. How long did he remain so?—A. He remained so, I guess, about four years—four or five years; I do not know which.

Q. I understand you, then, that since Dr. Reyburn left, one less night-nurse has been employed?—A. There was a change made during the summer. There was not many patients here, and one man had to go away. There was a change made before Dr. Reyburn went away. Dr. Reyburn told me there was not many patients here, and he wanted me to take charge of both wards until he could get some one. There came a fuss; he had to go away, and he went away in March. We did not have any white patients then except now and then. All of them pretty much were colored, and there was not many people. They did not admit as many people as they do now; the hospital was not as full as it is now. Of course during the winter they gave me two convalescents to help me; during that winter they did not hire any one, and it went on so. Since we have been crowded with both white and colored, sometimes we have not had room to put them.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You say more patients are in here now than at any former time?—A. Yes, sir; it has been so for the last two or three years—over two years anyhow. Under Dr. Reyburn's administration we did not have any white patients at all, only now and then we picked up one sick. Most all we had was colored.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Are you speaking about a great many more white patients now than there were then, or of a great many more patients altogether?—A. A great many more altogether. We have more, many more white altogether.

Q. And a great many more colored altogether?—A. A great many altogether.

Q. The hospital is pretty much crowded?—A. Very much crowded, only three or four beds vacant in wards number 1 and 2.

Q. How many beds were there generally vacant three or four years

ago?—A. Sometimes we had as many in one ward as nine or ten; but I do not know exactly close. They did not send so many people here then. Almost always in the winter, when it is very cold, and times very hard, we filled up; but in the last two years, going on three years past, we have been having more patients than we had for some time. Sometimes, of course, we got crowded when Dr. Reyburn was here, but it was pretty much all colored. There were two of us on, and he always made some of the convalescents help us. Each one of us would have one.

Q. Do you have any patients in separate rooms in your wards?—A. Not now; only now and then we sometimes have.

Q. Do you pay attention to those just the same as the others?—A. Yes, sir; go and see them as often as I can. Sometimes when I go through down-stairs, I go in and see them.

Q. How often would you go in to see them during the night?—A. Five or six times. Every time I go around I go in and see them.

Q. If any one makes a statement that you do not go to see them for 18 or 20 hours, he is in error?—A. Certainly. We had some two or three men in there sick, and other men would go in there and when they were very bad off and sit up with them—I mean convalescents who were walking about. There was not a man died in the room neglected. I know that and can find sufficient witness for that.

Q. Suppose a person dies in the night, what do you do?—A. I go and get assistance, wash them, and take them to the dead-house.

Q. Where do you wash them?—A. I get water in a tub and wash them right in the ward where they die, and take them right out.

Q. What do you dress them in?—A. Sometimes in the hospital clothes; sometimes their own clothes.

Q. Do you put their own clothes on them if they are dirty, or are they cleaned?—A. We put on clean clothes. We get clothes, shirt, and drawers, and things, and fix them up clean.

Q. You have charge as night-nurse of the ward in which Mr. Johnson is, have you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is the way you do in that ward?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Have there been many deaths in that ward?—A. We have not had many recently. There was a great many, but not recently.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Within a year how many?—A. I never keep an account of them; the books would tell.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What kind of food is given to the patients?—A. They get very good food.

Q. What do they have for breakfast?—A. They have bread and butter, tea, toast if any one needs it. Pretty much whatever they ask the doctor for they get. If a man is sick, and cannot eat anything heavy, he has toast and eggs—all the necessaries.

Q. How was that a year ago?—A. There was some complaint a year ago, but it did not amount to anything. The sick men always, when they ask for anything, get it, to my knowledge. Of course, I was not around much in the day with the doctors, but I was always there in the morning, and most anything they asked the doctor for, to my knowledge, the doctor would give it to them. I see egg, and custard, and

rice pudding, and milk and rice, and all those things, come up on the tray.

Q. Has that been true at any time during the last two or three years?—A. Yes, sir; that has been true.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. I take my meals at the table in the mess-room for the nurses and attendants.

Q. Do you have the same food as the others, and as the patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you have for breakfast?—A. Sometimes bread and butter, hominy, or rice, or whatever they have, and sometimes beef, sometimes pork.

Q. Has the mess-table been pretty much the same during the last two or three years?—A. All ate the same; the same food was put on the table; all came out of the same store-house.

Q. And it was the same two or three years ago that it is now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it cooked in the same way?—A. Yes, sir; cooked in the same way, by the same cooks.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Was there any trouble last summer, at any particular time, do you know, about getting poor food?—A. Last summer, three or four times the meat was not very good; it was not rotten, as some of them said. I do not know whether it was the heat or the weather, but it was tainted; three or four times the beef was not very good.

Q. Three or four times?—A. Yes; I think about four times, to my notice.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What kind of meat was brought in; quarters of beef, or what? Did you see the meat as it come into the hospital?—A. I did not see it when it came into the hospital.

Q. Did you see it in the hospital?—A. I saw it put on the table, and sometimes saw it when the men were delivering it, but never noticed it particularly.

Q. Was it like the ordinary meat in butchers' shops?—A. It looked fresh and good at times when I passed by, but I never paid particular attention to it.

Q. Was it composed of heads and tails and things of that kind, or was it regular beef?—A. I never saw any heads and tails at all. I saw twice on the table at dinner a piece of the heart of a beef, and other times a piece that they said was a piece of the udder, the heart some of them said, but that was only a small piece on the dish, that was cooked.

Q. Only on two occasions you ever saw any heart?—A. I saw a heart I think twice, and a piece that they said was udder; I do not know whether it came in among the meat and they cooked it or not.

Q. On one occasion?—A. Yes.

Q. But generally the beef was nice and fresh and good?—A. Yes, sir; the beef they had was good beef.

Q. How was the hominy that you had for breakfast; was it musty and bad?—A. There was sometimes about a few occasions I used to see the hominy musty. I did not know whether it was the oldness of it or not, but it was sometimes, not very often, but two or three times.

Q. Generally for these two or three years you are speaking of it, it was good?—A. Yes.

Q. How about the rice?—A. The rice was always good.

Q. How about the pork?—A. Sometimes the pork was strong. I do

not know whether it was owing to the cooking of it or not; but it seemed to be very strong sometimes.

Q. On the average, how was it?—A. On the average, fair pork.

Q. Do you mean salt pork?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was it on the average, generally?—A. The pork always seems to be pretty good, except sometimes.

Q. Except occasionally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Something has been said about salt mackerel furnished to the patients. Do you know about the ordinary quality of salt mackerel?—A. I do not know much about the mackerel.

Q. How was it usually?—A. The mackerel sometimes smelt kind of strong of brine, seemed to be old; but then the mackerel was good, only sometimes it was not soaked sufficient. That was all the trouble I saw.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. The salt was not soaked out of it?—A. Exactly.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you find the average of the last three or four months the same as the average of the three or four years you referred to?—A. I do not know whether they take more pains in cooking, but the food has been better than it was at some times.

Q. On the whole, how do you think it is—about the same?—A. On the whole, it is pretty much, I think, the same.

Q. Now is there about the same attention of the doctors going about their wards that there was before?—A. The doctor always comes every day, and any time the doctor is needed in the night I send for Dr. Glenan, and he never fails to come in any sickness.

Q. How is it in regard to the water-closets?—A. Some time last summer the water-closet was out of order one time, I think, for three or four weeks. We put two night-buckets in the room. Sometimes there were very sick men, and we did not have time to empty them very often, and some of the men would go there and see a bucketful and empty it. The sink was not very good, and some of them would abuse it and wet it, but we always went there and mopped it up of a night; we would take a scrubbing-cloth and clean it up. But then it was not so very bad. Those men that could not go out had night-buckets by their beds, and we always emptied them.

Q. One of the persons who have testified, speaks of the water-closet as having been two or three inches deep with excrement and filth during the night.—A. No, sir; there was nothing like that there. You can find sufficient witnesses to prove that is not so. I heard that Mr. Felton said that; but the water-closet could not be that deep; no, sir.

Q. Could it be anything like that?—A. No. When some of them would go in there they would stand up and wet on the floor; the urine would drop on the floor; but there were plenty of men walking about, and sometimes when we would be very busy down-stairs, some of them would go in there and empty the bucket. The bucket was a large bucket, as large as a water-bucket.

Q. You say the patients would do that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And would slop the seat?—A. Yes, sir; some of them, when they would go in there, would wet in the bucket, and some of it fell on the floor; but it was not inches deep; it was only where it dropped around the bucket on the floor.

Q. You say you would go and mop it up and clean it up whenever

you discovered the patients had done anything of that kind?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was a urinal put in that water-closet?—A. The urinal was put there, I think, a while before the investigation.

Q. Had there ever been a urinal there before?—A. Not in that ward. That ward had been built recently; but in these others there was.

Q. Were the urinals taken out?—A. There was not any put over there.

Q. But in the other wards, do you know whether the urinals were taken out?—A. I do not know about that, except that after we moved here they put the women in a ward where there was one. They used to have the women down-stairs in this brick building; but they moved them over yonder. I heard that the urinal was then taken out of that ward.

Q. Because it was turned into a woman's ward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are the patients cleanly about the closets, or do they defile them purposely?—A. Sometimes some old men go in there, and they drop something on the floor or the seats; but we always clean after them. They always acted pretty cleanly; kept it tolerably clean.

Q. How happened this water-closet to get out of order this summer?—A. There were some of the pipes leaking out there, and the engineer took out the pipes and did not put them back.

Q. Who was the engineer?—A. Mr. Calvert—John J. Calvert.

Q. Then it was his neglect of duty in not putting them back?—A. Certainly. I cannot put it on any one else than him, because he took the pipe out. We complained about it leaking, and he came there and took out the seat and pipe and things and did not put them back.

Q. How happened they to be put back? Who ordered them back, do you know?—A. We spoke about it two or three times. Dr. Palmer came up one day and said he did not know the water-closet was out of repair. I think, just before the fuss, Mr. Felton complained of it, and the doctor came up there, and then he said he did not know the water-closet was taken to pieces.

Q. Did he order it fixed then, or was it fixed at once?—A. It was fixed at once. He had the seat put in, the pipe fixed, and a urinal fixed in right away.

Q. Had Dr. Palmer been absent for a short time then?—A. Yes, sir; he had been absent.

Q. For how long, about?—A. I think about three weeks.

Q. And on his return his attention was called to it, and he had it fixed?—A. Yes, sir; I have been working in the hospital during the time of the war, and ever since the hospital was over there (indicating). I remember he was away.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You have spoken of the attendance of the physicians as being good. Whenever they were needed in the night they came?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now I want to ask you this general question, you having been here a dozen years: has the attention of the physicians been as good for the past three years as it was before for six or five years previously?—A. They always came around the same in the morning just as they did before, and if any one was sick of a night, we sent for Dr. Glennan and he never refused to come. I can say that. I cannot say any other way. If it was twelve o'clock or one o'clock, it made no difference.

Q. I want you to say exactly as it is. The attention is as good now as it ever was?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And has been for the past three years as good as it was for six years before?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make?—A. No, sir.

SAMUEL STEWART (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been in the hospital?—Answer. I have been here near two years.

Q. Which ward are you in?—A. Dr. Purvis's.

Q. What is the number of it?—A. No. 2.

Q. You can make any statement you wish in regard to the hospital, the treatment, the food, or any other subject.—A. The food of the ward, the extra diets, are now very well; but before the investigation they were bad, generally. What we got at the dining-room was very bad. The men in the ward who were very sick would get extras, such as corn-starch and milk-toast. Dr. Purvis has been very good to me ever since I have been here.

Q. Has he shown any favoritism to you?—A. No, sir; he has always acted courteously with me. I have not been a patient ever since I have been here.

Q. What were you before?—A. I was appointed a nurse here. I was, about seven months on the nurse list. Then I was taken sick with this scrofula, as the doctor calls it, and I was discharged from nurse and put down as a patient in the ward.

Q. Is Dr. Purvis attentive to other patients besides yourself?—A. O, yes, sir. He has the whole ward, you know. I mean he has been good to me; he has always acted courteously to me as though he thought a good deal of me, or something.

Q. Does he see that you have all necessary food?—A. Yes, sir. Recently, since the investigation, every thing has been very nice.

Q. What was there five months ago that you did not get in the way of extra food, if you needed it?—A. Four or five months ago, before this investigation, it was very bad down at the dining-room. There was scarcely any meat besides bones, and the bread was sour part of the time, and the corn-bread badly made up.

Q. You can make any other statement you wish.—A. Well, sir, I do not know of anything more that I can tell now. Of course, I am sick, and I do not feel like talking.

LUCIUS HARCÓMB (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What position do you hold here?—Answer. I take care of the sick.

Q. Are you a day nurse?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what ward?—A. Ward No. 2.

Q. What kind of care do you take of the sick?—A. I try to do the best I can for them.

Q. Are you attentive in the discharge of your duties?—A. I do try, sir.

Q. Do you have any patients in separate rooms?—A. Not now.

Q. Have you had at any time?—A. We have had one room we kept bad patients in.

Q. You mean very sick?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had charge of them with the others?—A. I had.

- Q. Did you attend to the patients in that room as much as to others?—
 A. I did just the same.
- Q. Did you ever neglect them for eighteen or twenty hours?—A. No, sir. The only time I was out the doctor got me to go and clean his house, about a day in all, I suppose.
- Q. Doctor who?—A. Dr. Glennan.
- Q. When there you always attended to those patients?—A. I did. I am walking around all day long, seeing to one first and then another.
- Q. Mr. Johnson states, as I understood him, that you said that you left the patients in that room for eighteen or twenty hours, and that they cried in distress and you would go nowhere near them. Is that correct?—A. It is not so.
- Q. Is there any foundation for such a story?—A. The other nurse who is with me will testify to the same thing as I do. It has not been so since I have been here.
- Q. Have you ever said to Mr. Johnson anything of that kind?—A. I never have, and I never heard about it anyhow, until the committee was up there the other week. I must not tell anything more than is so, I suppose.
- Q. Of course not.—A. I was astonished myself, when I heard that, because such a thing had not happened.
- Q. Do you ever have persons die in your ward?—A. Yes, sir.
- Q. How many deaths have occurred there during the last six months?—A. I cannot tell, really.
- Q. Give it as nearly as you can.—A. Six, I suppose, or about that. I would not like to confine myself to any particular number.
- Q. What do you do with patients when they die—after they are dead?—A. Dress them and take them out to the dead-house.
- Q. Do you wash them before dressing them?—A. I do.
- Q. In the ward?—A. Yes, sir; I take them off the bed.
- Q. What is your method of doing it? Do you bring in tubs?—A. A bucket generally, and sponge them off.
- Q. Sponge them off thoroughly?—A. Yes, sir.
- Q. How long does it generally take to do that?—A. About ten or fifteen minutes.
- Q. Then what do you clothe them with?—A. Generally I put on the old clothing.
- Q. Is that clothing clean that you put on them; has it been cleaned?—
 A. Not all. I generally put on clean underclothing. We have been generally putting on their old clothes, when they have any.
- Q. You put on clean underclothing and then the clothing that they wore when they came to the hospital?—A. Yes, sir. Generally we have the underclothing and top clothing washed when it is off; but sometimes a case may come in pretty late and die shortly after he gets in.
- Q. And then the bodies are removed to the dead-house?—A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do the patients that come in bring vermin with them?—A. Yes, sir; a good many.
- Q. What kind of vermin?—A. Bugs.
- Q. Lice?—A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Is it some trouble to keep down the vermin on that account?—A. No, sir; now it is not.
- Q. Why not?—A. We wash them thoroughly; take all the clothes to the wash-house and have them washed.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. In the summer is it not more difficult?—A. In the summer sometimes we accidentally get some few among the clothing in the ward.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Have you always washed them right along?—A. Yes, sir; I always wash every one who comes in; never fail if they come while I am on duty.

Q. Do you always have their clothes washed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has that been the habit for years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been a nurse?—A. I think fifteen years. I think it is a little over that. I was nurse in the time of the war, and have been nursing ever since.

Q. You take the same care of patients now that you have all the time?—A. Yes, sir. Of course now, ever since the investigation, it is better, I will acknowledge.

Q. Is your conduct better? Do you behave any better since the investigation?—A. No, sir; I am not speaking of that.

Q. I am speaking of your manner of washing and taking care of the patients.—A. That is my regular thing that I have been doing all the time.

Q. Do you wash them any more thoroughly than you did before?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are their clothes washed any more thoroughly than before?—A. Not at all.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Are the lice kept down better?—A. No, sir; I was talking about treatment.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You are an officer of the institution, and I am asking about your treatment?—A. That is just the same.

Q. Then, as far as everything relating to cleanliness is concerned, it is just the same as it was?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was just as good before the investigation as it is now?—A. O, yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. You did your duty just as well before as you do now?—A. I did.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Was your ward any cleaner before the investigation than it is now?—A. No, sir; I keep my ward just the same as I have always.

Q. Are you neglectful about your water-closets?—A. No, sir.

Q. What do you do about them?—A. I wash them out every morning. Sometimes I used to do it twice a day.

Q. Did you do that last summer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And before that?—A. Yes, sir; I always keep everything clean.

Q. Do the doctors inspect the hospital now?—A. Yes, sir; they go around every Saturday.

Q. Did they formerly go around every Saturday?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Doing the same things they do now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do the doctors ever look at the water-closets?—A. Yes, sir; they go in there.

Q. Did they use to do so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Just the same?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you keep the water-closet better now than before or just the same?—A. We can keep it better for one reason, because we have one of these big urinals stationary. Instead of wetting the seat, they use that now.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. That enables you to keep it somewhat cleaner?—A. Yes, sir. Before that I used to have to mop and clean it very often. When they went to urinate, it would fall on the seat and on the floor. Now, we do not have any of that.

Q. Do the doctors attend to their patients that are sick? Do they come when called?—A. Yes, sir; they do now.

Q. When did they not?—A. I thought the doctor was a little careless some time ago.

Q. What doctor?—A. Dr. Purvis.

Q. What instance do you know of that he was called and did not come?—A. I do not say he was called and did not come.

Q. What do you refer to?—A. One man used to sit up there who had a very bad throat. His name was Wilmer. It seemed that he neglected him some. He used to grumble some to me that he did.

Q. Did the doctor see this man every day?—A. He used to come through every day.

Q. Did the doctor attend to him—prescribe for him?—A. He did not do anything for his throat for a couple of days or so.

Q. Did he give him any medicines?—A. He mopped it like on a Friday and on Saturday he died.

Q. What did he do?—A. He mopped his throat—mopped it out.

Q. Had he prescribed any medicine for him at any time?—A. He tells me that he had, but I do not remember that he had.

Q. What else do you refer to in that connection?—A. There was one old gentleman named McGuire who had one arm. I think he treated him a little rougher than he should have done.

Q. What did he do?—A. He used to come around and crack him over his head and get him very fretful.

Q. Crack him over the head with what?—A. A little stick. He got the old man fretting. I think it did not become a doctor to do that.

Q. What kind of a stick was it?—A. A little cane.

Q. A cane that he carried in his hand?—A. No, sir; a cane that would be lying about on the bed in the ward.

Q. How long a cane?—A. I suppose as long as that one sitting there [pointing to a short walking-stick].

Q. What was the matter with the man?—A. He had a limb taken off. In fact, he had but one arm and one leg and one ear. One morning he came in and called the man and said something to him about coming away from the window. The old man did not come. He ordered the nurse to take him away. He went to take him away, and he jerked him backward. The old man was complaining some time; he hurt his back.

Q. This man was in the window?—A. Yes, sir; sitting at the window.

Q. And the doctor told him to come away from there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What reason did he give for him coming away?—A. He was talking to some person outside the ward.

Q. Talking about what?—A. I do not know what he was talking about.

Q. Was that contrary to the rules?—A. He told him to come away from the window, and he did not do it.

Q. Was it contrary to the rules?—A. It was.

Q. The man was violating the rules and the doctor told him to come away. He did not come, and he pulled him backward?—A. Yes, sir; of course he had no limbs to catch himself by, and he said it hurt his back.

Q. Did he fall on the floor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After the fall on the floor, what was done?—A. He made me take him out and take him down to the far ward.

Q. Was this the occasion that he tapped him on the head with his stick?—A. That was on the same day; but generally he used to come through and do it, and the old man got a sort of cross at the doctor. He said, "I am going to move away before the doctor comes to hit me with that stick." That was the reason he went to the window, he told me.

Q. Did the doctor hurt him when he touched him on the head with the stick?—A. He told me he did. His head was bald.

Q. Did he strike much?—A. Just tapped him.

Q. What do you mean by "tapped"? Did he assault the man and hurt him by striking him with a stick, apparently, or not?—A. He told me he done it.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Here is the stick you pointed to just now. Did he pick it up laughingly and smilingly like this [indicating]? Is that what you mean?—A. No; he did not come down that way.

Q. He did this [using the stick gently]?—A. Yes.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You mean that he touched him gently on the head with the stick, which irritated the old gentleman?—A. Yes, sir; that was it. He complained of his back after that.

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Where do you get your meals; in the mess-room?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With the other nurses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With the patients?—A. Down in the mess-room; yes, sir.

Q. Do you have good food?—A. We have pretty good food now.

Q. You put an emphasis on "now." Did you have good food five years ago?—A. Yes, sir; better than we have had sometimes.

Q. Confine yourself to answering the question. Did you five years ago have good food in the mess room, or do not you remember?—A. I think, sir, I must give you a true statement. I believe that our diet is a kind of cut-down.

Q. Five years ago?—A. No, not five years ago.

Q. Did you have good provisions five years ago?—A. I had; one reason why was because I used to draw my rations, and I used to have them cooked to suit myself.

Q. How about it three years ago?—A. It was just tolerable; I could not brag on it.

Q. How was it two years ago?—A. Still getting worse before the investigation.

Q. How was it one year ago?—A. Pretty bad, I tell you; the meat was poor.

Q. How was it last summer?—A. Last summer we had some pretty bad meat also.

Q. Beef?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the matter with it?—A. Poor beef.

Q. What do you mean by "poor"?—A. Beef that I call poor beef, stringy, bad beef.

Q. Do you mean occasionally or all the time?—A. Occasionally along; I do not say all the time.

Q. But occasionally there would be poor beef?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the bread good and sweet?—A. Sometimes, and sometimes bad.

Q. When you say it was "sometimes bad," do you mean that occasionally it was bad?—A. Yes, sir; that is the point.

Q. Did you have good corn-bread?—A. I do not know much about the corn-bread; I hardly ever eat any.

Q. Did you have good hominy?—A. The hominy was good.

Q. Always?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How about the rice; you had rice cooked, I suppose?—Yes; they had rice.

Q. Was that good?—A. I do not eat any.

Q. Therefore you do not know about it; but universally the hominy has been good?—A. Yes, sir; I have not seen anything the matter with it.

Q. How about the pork?—A. Well, sometimes that was tolerable, sometimes bad.

Q. When you say "sometimes bad," what do you mean?—A. Sometimes good pork and sometimes bad. Last summer we had some two or three times bad.

Q. Is the corned beef good?—A. We do not seem to have much of it. We have had it sometimes.

Q. Has it been good when you have had it?—A. That was tolerably good as far as I can say.

Q. I suppose you have a fish-day?—A. Yes, sir; but to tell you the truth, I am not a good judge of fish. I hear them grumbling about it, but I am not much of a judge about fish. I cannot say anything only what I know.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Are you a cook yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. You said a while ago that five years ago you drew your rations and cooked them yourself?—A. No; my wife cooked them.

Q. You think the cooking is not as good as you had five years ago when your wife cooked?—A. I just tell you, gentlemen, I believe, if I must come to the right thing, that the cooking is a great thing.

Q. That is what I want to get at, whether or not the raw material is bad, or whether some of the cooks may not make mistakes; which is it, in your opinion, chiefly?—A. One party would say it was the cooking—nothing like good cooks. Part of the grumbling is that the cooking is bad.

Q. Have they been changing cooks?—A. I have eaten enough to know something about cooking; there are the same cooks they have had.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What was the breakfast a year ago; what did you get?—A. Sometimes beef, sometimes pork; mostly beef for breakfast.

Q. Take last June and July; what did you get for breakfast then?—

A. Of course it was beef one morning, and fish sometimes once or twice in the week in the morning.

Q. Bread?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Hominy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Rice?—A. Hardly ever had rice for breakfast.

Q. Tea and coffee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What for dinner?—A. Chickens, some days, and beef.

Q. With bread and vegetables?—A. Yes, sir; sometimes.

Q. Was there any dinner that you did not have bread with?—A. No, sir; we had bread all the time.

Q. Did you have as much bread as was wanted?—A. Yes, sir; no fault in not having bread, so far as I know.

Q. Did patients complain that they did not have bread enough?—A. They always had bread enough.

Q. How much bread did they have?—A. Two slices, generally.

Q. How much would that amount to; a quarter of a loaf or half a loaf?—A. I think about a quarter of a loaf.

Q. Two slices?—A. Two slices; yes, sir.

Q. Suppose anybody wanted any more bread; would he get it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. No trouble about that?—A. No, sir.

Q. What vegetables did you have for dinner?—A. In the ward we had potatoes.

Q. What size were the potatoes and what quality and how were they cooked?—A. Generally mashed potatoes.

Q. Were they sometimes in the jackets?—A. Not in the ward; they have been in the dining-room.

Q. I am speaking of the mess-table specially.—A. They generally have them in the jackets there.

Q. How many potatoes to a man?—A. Sometimes two, sometimes one, according to the size.

Q. Some good-sized ones?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the mess-room, was there any trouble about their not having bread enough?—A. I do not know much about the mess-room. I am generally in the ward at the eating-time of my patients.

Q. Where do you eat yourself?—A. I eat down there; they eat before I do.

Q. Do you have the same food that the patients do in the mess-room?—A. Pretty much.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Do you hear any complaints there as you go down about a lack of bread?—A. I have heard some.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. How much bread do they have? You have been there sometimes in the mess-room?—A. Yes, sir; they generally have about two slices when I go down there.

Q. Suppose they want more bread, can they get?—A. I suppose so. I do not know of any objection.

Q. Do you hear any complain that they cannot get it when they want it?—A. I did hear one of the patients get after the doctor one morning.

Q. Who was that?—A. A white gentleman who had been here. He said to the doctor, "Suppose I was to see a Congressman and he asked me why I looked so bad," and the doctor says, "Well, you could tell him that we could have so many more." He said they got enough, and I believe it passed off in that way.

Q. Did this man ask for more bread and not get it?—A. He told me he spoke to Dr. Glennan after he came up.

Q. What else do they have down there in the mess-room for breakfast?—A. For breakfast they have fish sometimes.

Q. Do they have meat?—A. Yes, sir; they have meat.

Q. And hominy?—A. Hominy, I think.

Q. And sometimes rice?—A. I do not think they have rice.

Q. Are you sure they ever had meat at breakfast in the mess-room?—A. They have been having it occasionally of late.

Q. I speak of last June and July.—A. Now, I do not think I can say about that.

Q. Why not? You ate down there.—A. We had meat, of course.

Q. Did you have the same as the patients?—A. The same as they did upstairs; yes, sir. I thought you were asking about the patients that went down to the mess.

Q. I speak about the patients who eat in the mess-room. I want to know if you are willing to swear that they did not have meat down there.—A. Now, I cannot, exactly.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Had you meat in the mess-room during that time?—A. I did.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Did you have the same as the patients down there?—A. I think I did.

Q. Mr. Potter thinks they did not have any meat in the mess-room—we want to know whether they did or not—in June, July, and August last?—A. Gentlemen, to tell you the truth, I am not sure about that.

Q. But you are sure you did?—A. I know I did, because I generally have all I see patients upstairs have. If I knew it I would tell you.

Q. You think you had the same as the patients down in the mess-room?—A. I think I did.

Q. Do you know Mr. Potter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you help him change his bed when he first came or shortly after he got here?—A. How do you mean?

Q. The mattress that he slept on?—A. Yes, sir; we changed them.

Q. You say you changed them; or when a patient comes do you give him a clean bed and mattress?—A. No, sir; I generally change the sheets, blankets, &c.

Q. How about the mattresses?—A. We do not change them except when a person dies or anything like that.

Q. Was Mr. Potter's mattress in a very bad condition when he called your attention to it?—A. Yes, sir; it was an old one, and I took it out, of course.

Q. How happens it that you let it remain there in a bad condition?—A. The doctors had some made up new and we fitted our ward up with them.

Q. And you had not got around to him yet?—A. No, sir.

Q. But you were doing it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you have done it if your attention had not been called to it?—A. Of course. Generally I did it always.

Q. Did you find a thousand bed-bugs in that bed?—A. No, sir; there were some.

Q. How many do you think when you took it down into the yard?—A. Some few in it.

Q. Many dozen?—A. Whenever they complained of bed-bugs I cleaned them.

Q. He complained that there were bed-bugs, and you changed the bed for him, and you found a few in it?—A. There was a few in it.

Q. Was Mr. Potter himself free from vermin when he came?—A. I will not be certain whether he had any on him or not.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Did you wash him?—A. I did.

Q. Can you not tell?—A. He was pretty dirty, but I will not be sure he had any on him. I never saw any on his clothes.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Was he ragged and dirty, or simply dirty in his person?—A. Dirty. He was not ragged. He was dirty. His clothes were dirty.

OWEN CHASE (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What position have you in this hospital?—Answer. Nurse.

Q. How long have you been a nurse?—A. I cannot tell you how many years. I have been a nurse ever since the old hospital—nearly a year before they moved from the old hospital here.

Q. What ward are you in?—A. Ward number 5.

Q. How long have you had charge of that ward—several years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that a man's ward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you a day-nurse or a night-nurse?—A. Both.

Q. Do you mean that you work twenty-four hours in the day?—A. I work all day. I do not work all night. They have not had but one nurse in there now for three years this June coming, until the 16th of this month, when they put on another nurse. That was last Saturday or Friday, I do not know which.

Q. How does the number of patients in your ward compare with what it was two or three years ago?—A. They are about the same now that they were four or five years ago. I never had less than from twenty-two to twenty-five, and from that up to thirty. I have had as high as thirty. I have even thirty now, since they put on one patient for a nurse. I have had more, and I have had less.

Q. You do not know whether you are a day-nurse or a night-nurse?—A. We have no night-nurse; only, of course, if there is anything needed, I am always there every night.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you sleep in the ward?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Then you are a day-nurse only, but you attend to patients at night if it is necessary to do so?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Are the persons in your ward very sick patients?—A. No; they are old, worn-out men, and lunatics, and boys.

Q. They all sleep nights, as well as yourself?—A. They sleep; but sometimes they have fits and fall out of bed, and I attend to them.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You do not have to give regular medicines?—A. Whenever any of them are sick.

Q. To how many of those in the ward at the present time do you have to give medicines regularly?—A. Only two at the present time.

Q. How often do you give them medicines?—A. One a teaspoonful three times a day, and the other a tablespoonful three times a day.

Q. And at night?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you had these patients?—A. One of these, the old man, came in here last summer; and the young one, the one that takes the teaspoonful, here ever since the hospital; he came from the other side. He just has fits and gets sick from them.

Q. During the last year have you given them this medicine three times a day, and at night?—A. No, sir; not regularly, only when he has fits. This old man has just been taken sick.

Q. How lately?—A. He was just taken sick here this week.

Q. You now have a person on at night?—A. Yes, sir; and then, any other time when any of the old men are sick, of course I have to attend to the medicine just the same way.

Q. Do you keep your ward clean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you do to keep it clean?—A. I scrub it every other day, and wash the ceiling, clean the beds, &c.

Q. Every other day?—A. I do not clean the beds every other day, but scrub the floors every other day; and the walls and ceilings I wash three or four times a year.

Q. What steps do you take to keep vermin out?—A. Here of late we have some kind of dose—I do not know what kind it is.

Q. Hart's roach-powder, is it?—A. It kills the roaches considerably, but I have some few in there now. Of these other vermin, of course we have some few, and bed-bugs, too; that you find everywhere; but the other vermin, I have had a good many of them, but I am entirely clear of them now. I have not seen one of them in my ward for the last three months, or it is very near three months since I saw one of that kind there.

Q. Do you try any harder to keep it clean now than you did three months ago?—A. In fact I am more able now than I really was three months ago. A little over a year ago I was taken down with the neuralgia in the head, and rheumatism, and I could not do anything at all for some considerable time. I was in bed; could not turn over, scarcely able to feed myself; and then the patients had not any nurse. Patients waited on patients, and that was the way my ward went; patients coming in with vermin on them, and nobody to take charge, only patients taking care of patients, as a matter of course that is the way my ward got full of vermin. It was a long time before I got so as I could do anything much; I was knocking about and taking care of myself the best I could. I took medicine and rubbed myself until I got up; and then the stronger I got the more able I was to work; and so when I got up strong and good, I just went to work and worked regularly through the day until I got them clear.

Q. How was it before you were taken sick? Did you have your ward pretty clean?—A. The ward was pretty clean with the exception of sometimes some one would come in that had vermin on them, and they would sit down before I would get a chance to clean them with hot water and put on clean clothes, and they would drop some on the floor.

Q. And is that the case now, or is liable to be the case at any time?—A. That is liable to be the case at any time.

Q. The persons brought into the hospital come from the hovels and the poor places, have no money, and are wretched?—A. They have very little clothes, and some of them are very dirty.

Q. And it is a constant fight to keep things clean, I suppose?—A.

Yes, sir; it is. It has not been kept as bad with me the last week past since they put on another nurse; of course it relieves me some now.

Q. Did you complain somewhat of overwork, of being too hard worked?

—A. Yes, sir; I have been complaining of that for some time.

Q. What pay do you get?—A. Fifteen dollars a month.

Q. And your board?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. I eat at the table; the nurses all eat at one table. We do not eat at the patients' table. The nurses have a table.

Q. Do you have the same food as the patients in the mess room?—A. If anything, our food is a little more magnificent about it than it is about the patients' at the table. The patients in my ward and the nurses, that is the patients I have to carry the diet to, have it very good now. They have plenty of it, and they have that which is very good now.

Q. When did they not?—A. Since this investigation they have been having it better than they really did before.

Q. What is the difference?—A. The difference is that the meat sometimes, particularly through the summer, was tainted and bad, and the hominy not done, and a great part of the time the rice was very indifferent, and the mackerel were sometimes short, sometimes not cooked as it might have been.

Q. Do you have mackerel in the wards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was it in the winter; was the meat good in the winter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean this winter, or last winter a year ago?—A. We did not have any tainted meat then at all along through the winter.

Q. Was the meat good last winter?—A. To the best of my recollection I do not know that we had any bad meat at all last winter.

Q. Were they heads and tails that you got, or was it regular beef?—A. I do not know about the tails; I cannot say anything about that; but we got beef heads and jaws, or something of the sort connected with the head.

Q. Cooked up?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often did you have beef-jaws?—A. I cannot say how often.

Q. Why not?—A. Well, I do not recollect the number of times.

Q. Was it often?—A. Well, it was occasionally.

Q. Did you get any on your plate?—A. I did sometimes; yes, sir.

Q. How often? Once a week?—A. No, sir; not as often as that.

Q. Once a month?—A. Maybe once in two weeks, or something like that.

Q. You got a piece of the jaw?—A. Yes, sir; a piece of the jaw.

Q. How do you know it was a piece of a jaw? Did it have the teeth?—A. The inside of a beef's jaw has a kind of rough something, almost like a beef's tongue. Sometimes I would get hold of a piece of that.

Q. Was it beef's tongue you were speaking of?—A. No, sir; I was speaking of beef's jaw, and I was coming to the tongue next.

Q. I want to understand about the jaw. Remember you are under oath, and I want you to state about this beef's jaw you got, and how you knew it was beef's jaw.—A. Here is what I call beef's jaw; what comes off under here (indicating).

By Mr. EATON:

Q. That is the lower jaw?—A. That is what I call jaw. A piece off that I could tell very easily.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. How ?—A. By this rough part being inside here. I know exactly how it is inside of a cow's mouth. I got a piece of that several times. I cannot say how many, but several times I got a piece of that.

Q. Did you ever see any part of a head ?—A. No, sir ; I could not say that I saw any other part of a head.

Q. Now, tell me what you mean by your food being more magnificent than the others ? Is this an evidence of the magnificence ?—A. What I mean is that what the nurses have on the table has a little more magnificence than what is on the other table.

Q. Why ? How ?—A. Well, it is all cooked very well, but ours, of course, are a little finer and a little more magnificently cooked.

Q. How ? Is it not all cooked at the same time and in the same kettles ?—A. That I cannot say. I am not in there to see.

Q. Then explain.—A. Sometimes we have boiled ham for breakfast for the patients, and ours is very often fried—the cold ham warmed up, you know. The patients have cold boiled ham when they have ham for breakfast.

Q. Do the patients in the mess-room have ham for breakfast, and how long have they had it ?—A. I cannot say how long, but I know they have it sometimes. I am not at the patients' table.

Q. You are drawing a comparison between the two, and I want to know how correct your knowledge is. Did they have ham a year ago ?—A. The patients ?

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Or Yourself ?—A. Sometimes ; yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Or the patients ?—A. I know in winter-time, it was not short then, but I mean to say that through the summer, last summer the ham was short sometimes. Sometimes it was very good.

Q. But I want to know if you had it, and the patients had it ?—A. Well, my patients had it ; but whether they had it on the table or not, I do not know, because I was not in there to know.

Q. Did they have beef on the patients' table at breakfast ?—A. Yes, sir : sometimes they have beef.

Q. I am not speaking about now, but I mean then.—A. A Year ago ?

Q. A year or two years ago.—A. They had beef for dinner certainly.

Q. I am speaking about breakfast.—A. Not for breakfast.

Q. Did they have any meat for breakfast a year or two ago ?—A. No, sir.

Q. You swear positively to that ?—A. If they did, I did not see it.

Q. Did you have it ?—A. We had it ; the nurses had it.

Q. And you know that you had what they did not have ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A year or two ago ?—A. Yes, sir. I know that then the patients that came to the mess-room did not have meat for breakfast. They had meat for dinner.

Q. And they had no meat of any kind for breakfast and no fish ?—A. For breakfast ? No, I do not think they had. I will not be real certain about the fish, but I know they did not have meat.

Q. What did they have for breakfast ?—A. They had rice and molasses, coffee and bread.

Q. You say they have now meat—ham ?—A. They have meat now for breakfast and for dinner.

Q. When did they commence first to have meat for breakfast ? Fix

the date?—A. To the very best of my knowledge they commenced it just about——

Q. I want the date, the month.—A. Well, now, I do not know what month it was that the investigation took place.

Q. I am not talking about the investigation. I want to know just the time when they began having meat for breakfast in this hospital.—A. Well, now, I could not tell the month, but all the way I can come at this point is just about the time that that commenced going on, but I really do not know whether it was September or October.

Q. Then you will say that before September at the mess-table of the patients they had no meat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you say that since that time they have had it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who is the doctor of your ward?—A. Dr. Glennan.

Q. Is he attentive to the patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has he always been?—A. Always has been ever since I have been under him; always very attentive to the patients.

Q. Is he kind to them?—A. Yes, sir; he is very kind to them.

Q. Does he inspect the ward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often?—A. Every day.

Q. Has that always been his habit?—A. Yes, sir; ever since he had that ward in charge.

Q. How long has he had the ward in charge?—A. Ever since last July.

Q. Does he inspect the water-closet as well?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you keep your water-closet?—A. I keep it now, since I have got able, very nicely.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You did before you were sick, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir; before I was sick, but I say now it fell back when I was sick.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. With the exception of the time you were sick has it been clean or unclean?—A. It was not as clean before that as it has been since.

Q. Did you neglect it?—A. Yes, sir; I did sometimes, because I could not possibly help it; I had so much to attend to.

Q. What, with thirty old persons, only two of whom were sick so as to have to take medicine?—A. But then I have fiftied ones, and they are sometimes one place and sometimes another, and it is a heavy burden on one person's hands to look after all these things, attend to them, and keep them in their place.

Q. What condition was your water-closet in when you neglected it?—A. The patients sometimes would nasty on the seats, sometimes right down on the floor, and they would make water right on the seats.

Q. When you found that out you would go and clean it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Invariably?—A. Yes, sir; whenever I found it out.

Q. Would you go to look and see whether it was in good condition or not?—A. Yes, sir; I did not do it all the time; I did sometimes; because sometimes I was actually so busy about other things that I did not think of it. I sometimes would go round there just for myself and find out it was in a bad condition, and I would then get my broom and water and mop and clean it.

Q. Do your patients still dirty the seat and the floor as they used to do?—A. They do it now, some of them.

Q. They are poor, helpless, demented creatures, are they not?—A. Yes, sir; a great many of them are.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Are you able to keep the persons of these people clean ?—A. Yes, sir ; I keep them clean.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do you ever have any deaths in your ward ?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. What do you do with a person when he dies ?—A. I wash him and fix him up as genteely as I can, and get the stretcher and carry him to the dead-house.

Q. Do you wash him in the ward ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What clothes do you put on him ?—A. If he has any clothes of his own I put on his own clothes if they are good ; if not, I put the government clothes on.

Q. Do you put clean underclothes on him ?—A. Yes, sir.

WESLEY LUCAS (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you a patient in this hospital ?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been in it ?—A. I have been in now going on twelve months.

Q. What ward are you in ?—A. Chase's ward.

Q. Is that No. 5 ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your disease ?—A. When I came here I had fits of the chills. When I first came in here I had sore feet.

Q. What doctor takes care of you ?—A. Dr. Glennan has been attending me since I have been here.

Q. Have you been in his ward all the time ?—A. Yes, sir ; in Chase's ward all the time.

Q. Does Mr. Glennan take good care of you ?—A. Well, so far.

Q. What do you mean by "so far" ?—A. Well, he has been attending a little better now than he used to.

Q. Dr. Glennan attends to you now better than he used to ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what respect ?—A. Things that I needed at the first offstart I could not get until lately ; and now lately I can get almost anything I call for.

Q. What do you call for ?—A. Sometimes I call for some clothing and some shoes.

Q. They give you clothing and shoes now, do they ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Anything else ?—A. I do not call for anything but I get it. I did ask them for some money for doing jobs round here, but could get none.

Q. Jobs around the hospital ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They would not pay you any money for that ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you get what you wanted to eat ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where do you eat ?—A. In the dining-room.

Q. What do you get to eat ?—A. Friday we have fish and potatoes and bread.

Q. For breakfast ?—A. We do not have any fish for breakfast, but we sometimes get cod-fish on Friday.

Q. For breakfast ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you get any meat for breakfast ?—A. No, sir ; very seldom.

Q. Do you get any ham for breakfast ?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. What do you get ?—A. We have hominy some mornings, and sometimes have rice.

By Mr. SARGENT :

- Q. Do you have bread?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. How much bread do you have?—A. I get two slices of bread now.
 Q. As much bread as you want?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Did you always get two slices of bread?—A. I did not use to have two slices of bread until here lately. They have lately taken it up.
 Q. Did you use to have one slice?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Was the one slice any larger then than one of the two slices is now?
 —A. No, just the same thing.
 Q. You get twice as much bread now as you did then?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Did you use to ask for any more bread?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Whom did you ask for more bread?—A. The waiter-man.
 Q. Did the waiter-man tell you he would not let you have it?—A. He would give only what he was allowed to give.
 Q. Who was the waiter-man?—A. George Gray was one of them, and they got John Lewis there for waiter-man.
 Q. Was he the one who would not give you any more?—A. He has just lately come in.
 Q. Who is the one who would not give you any more?—A. George Gray was the head one.
 Q. You asked George Gray for more bread and he would not give it to you?—A. He would give as far as the orders. The orders were but one slice of bread.
 Q. And he would not give you any more?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

- Q. How large were these slices of bread?—A. A thin slice.
 Q. As thick as your hand?—A. About as wide as my hand.

By Mr. SARGENT :

- Q. How many slices to a loaf?—A. I cannot tell you, but we get two slices now.
 Q. How much of a loaf was the one slice when you used to get it?—
 A. I do not know now.
 Q. A quarter of a loaf?—A. They cut up a whole loaf.
 Q. Into four pieces?—A. Six pieces.
 Q. How many do they cut it up into now?—A. The same now they did at first.
 Q. And they give you two pieces instead of one?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

- Q. Do you eat it all?—A. Yes, sir, every bit.

By Mr. EATON :

- Q. Could you stand another piece?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. You do not get meat enough now?—A. Not quite enough, but I have to put up with what I get.

By Mr. SARGENT :

- Q. Do you get some hominy with it?—A. We get hominy in the morning.
 Q. Nothing else?—A. We get nothing but hominy some mornings, and coffee and bread.
 Q. Other mornings?—A. Rice some mornings.

By Mr. ALLISON :

- Q. Do you get all the hominy you want?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you get all the rice you want now?—A. No, not often.

Q. You do not get enough to eat now?—A. Not enough, but I put up with what I get now.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You did before, did you not?—A. I say I have to put up with what I get.

Q. Do you get coffee enough?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any one thing you have enough of?—A. I do not get enough of anything, but then I have to put up with what I get.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you take any medicine?—A. Yes, sir; I have been taking medicine.

Q. What medicine?—A. I do not know what kind of medicine it is.

Q. How often do you take it?—A. I have not taken any now since I got better for some time.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Do you get all the medicine you want?—A. Yes, sir; when I have cause for it.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Were you present at the time some bones were dug up near by the dead-house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State what you saw there.—A. All I can state is that they were the same bones I helped to put away.

Q. What bones did you help put away?—A. Some were put up in the building that I helped to carry there.

Q. Whom did you carry them for?—A. For Mr. Banks.

Q. Do you know whom Banks carried them for?—A. No, sir.

Q. What did you help him carry?—A. I helped him carry one body and put it in the dead-house and then I helped him carry some more, one stuff and another, at night.

Q. What did you help him carry?—A. It was entrails, and I cannot tell you what all the other parts were; but it was in barrels, and I helped to carry in the barrels.

Q. What did you do with it?—A. Buried it.

Q. Where?—A. One right by the wood-pile and the other next to the Seventh-street entrance.

Q. How many barrels?—A. I carried three barrels there.

Q. When was that?—A. I cannot tell you exactly what month it was.

Q. Did you empty the matter out of the barrels?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How deep was the hole you dug?—A. I reckon about four feet, as near as I can come at it.

Q. And you covered it up?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did that on two occasions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has that been dug up since?—A. I understand it was taken up once. I did not go back there when they were taking it up.

Q. Were the barrels full?—A. Pretty near full. They were not top full.

Q. Were they headed up?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where did you take them from?—A. I took the barrels out of the basement.

Q. Where were they buried?—A. All of them were buried at the same place that I carried out of the basement, excepting the body.

The body I helped to put in the dead-house. I do not know what they did with that.

Q. That was a whole body, was it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what they do with the bodies of the patients who die in the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never have had anything to do with carrying them to the dead-house?—A. No, sir.

DANIEL REED (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you connected with this institution?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you do?—A. I am a teamster.

Q. Driver?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you carry?—A. I haul groceries and bread and anything that is needful for the hospital.

Q. Do you bring the meats?—A. No, sir; I do not haul the meats.

Q. Do you have charge of the feed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many horses are kept?—A. Only two.

Q. You drive one; and who drives the other?—A. Robert Delany.

Q. Do you know anything about cows being kept on the grounds?—A. Yes, sir; there are cows here on the ground.

Q. Do those cows belong to the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are those cows fed out of the feed used for hospital purposes?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have they ever been fed out of that feed?—A. Never to my knowledge.

Q. You have never fed any feed out to them?—A. No.

Q. Do you have charge of the feed?—A. I do.

Q. And you would know if it was used for any other purposes, as for feeding cows?—A. I would know that, of course; certainly. I have charge of the feed.

Q. The cows you refer to are down on the lower lot?—A. Yes, sir; there is but one here now, at this time.

Q. Whom does that belong to?—A. Dr. Glennan.

Q. Does he find his own feed for his cow?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And so far as any cows have ever been here, to your knowledge, the owners have fed them?—A. They have furnished feed for them.

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make?—A. No, sir; there is no statement I have to make.

ROBERT DELANY (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you connected with the hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity?—A. Ambulance-driver.

Q. What do you haul?—A. I haul the sick and bury the dead, and do anything that comes to hand.

Q. Where are the dead carried?—A. To potters' field, unless their friends take them, and then I carry them to any other burial-ground they want.

Q. Do you have anything to do with the hauling of meats?—A. Sometimes.

Q. What kind of meat do you bring—quarters, or what parts of the animal?—A. I bring the roast, the big chuck pieces, sometimes; what they call the thigh.

Q. That is the round?—A. The round, yes; and breast of mutton and the hind legs of mutton, and corned-beef—the brisket.

Q. Do you ever bring heads?—A. I never brought any heads. One time I saw a heart in there but then George would not take it; he sent it back to the butcher.

Q. Do you ever bring any of the jaws of animals?—A. You mean the fleshy part. I have seen one or two of them, but he sent them back to the butcher.

Q. Is the meat that you bring good and fresh?—A. Yes, sir; I never saw anything out of the way.

Q. Do you have anything to do with the feed?—A. I have no charge of it. The other driver has charge of the feed.

Q. Have you ever known of the feed belonging to the government being used for private cows?—A. No, sir; I attend to Dr. Purvis's cow, and he bought all his feed for it for a while.

Q. Dr. Purvis himself bought the feed?—A. Yes, sir; and sometimes he gave me money to get it. Sometimes he would order it himself. That was the only cow I ever had anything to do with.

Q. You have seen one or two other cows about here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they are not fed out of the government feed?—A. Not that I know of.

SATURDAY, *February 23, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the Freedmen's Hospital.

JOHN J. CALVERT (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What position do you hold in this hospital?—Answer. Engineer.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. About 8 years, as near as I come to it.

Q. What is your compensation?—A. At the present time it is \$30 a month.

Q. Was it more than that formerly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much?—A. Ninety dollars. I got \$60, and then \$30 for my services as plumber and gas fitter doing all the repairs around the place. At this time they have cut that off.

Q. When was that discontinued?—A. The 30th of June. I have received but \$60 a month since the 30th of June, 1877.

Q. Has any promise been made to you of the restoration of that addition in case of a change of Dr. Palmer from the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has any one promised you higher wages in case Dr. Palmer is removed?—A. No, sir; I have never had any conversation in regard to that.

Q. And has anybody ever promised you a better situation in case Dr. Palmer should be removed?—A. No, sir; if they had I should certainly have been away from here.

Q. Have you not said that was so?—A. I have not.

Q. To any one?—A. Not to any one.

Q. And it is not true?—A. It is not true.

Q. How much time each day are you employed necessarily?—A. I get here about seven o'clock in the morning, start my fires, fill my tanks around. There are three days in the week that I do the washing of the hospital.

Q. What do you mean by doing the washing of the hospital?—A. By steam.

Q. Furnishing the steam for it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you anything to do with the washing except to furnish the steam?—A. I run the engine and attend to the machinery during wash-days.

Q. How long does that take you?—A. Monday is what we call the very heavy wash-day; it takes me until twelve o'clock in the day to do that washing alone, from the time I get up steam. Tuesday I fill the tanks all around the place.

Q. How long does that take?—A. Couple of hours, I guess, in the morning, and a couple of hours in the afternoon. I generally leave my tanks all full at night, to be ready in case of fire.

Q. What do you do the rest of the day?—A. I pump water up the hill to the Howard University.

Q. How long does that take?—A. My orders are to pump an hour every day.

Q. Do you do that?—A. Yes, sir. "Sometimes they complain a good deal, and when they complain, if they are out of water, I have to pump an additional time. I do it when there is a complaint made of there being a scarcity of water up there. Wednesday is wash-day; it takes to about eleven o'clock. I go through the same routine day by day.

Q. What do you do the rest of that Wednesday?—A. I fill the tanks, I pump water up the hill, and then attend to repairs, leakages, or anything of that kind around the place, whatever there is. I saw wood.

Q. Are you here every day?—A. Every day.

Q. All day long?—A. All day long.

Q. Where were you yesterday?—A. Yesterday I had permission to go to the temperance procession; I belong to the blue badge, and I asked permission before I started, after I had done my work.

Q. What time did you go?—A. I went, as near as I can judge, between nine and ten o'clock; I think that was the hour; I am not positive.

Q. You had done your work at that time?—A. Yes, sir; I had done what pumping, and so forth, was required around and cleaned the place; I had done the washing the day before.

Q. When were you absent before that?—A. If I want to go down street I generally ask permission. I am never a day off you may say.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Of whom do you ask permission?—A. Of the doctors here; Dr. Glennan sometimes; sometimes Dr. Purvis; whoever is here.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What time do you start the fire under the boiler in the morning?—A. One of the nurses starts the fire for me now of a morning; that is, he merely kindles the fire. I come here—

Q. What time do you get here?—A. I get here about seven o'clock.

Q. What time is the fire started in the morning in the boiler?—A. About six o'clock.

Q. What time do you let it go out?—A. I generally bed it at night, keeping merely enough to heat water for cooking purposes. I keep the steam for cooking purposes always.

Q. What time do you bed it?—A. About four o'clock.

Q. Is all this necessary to do the work of the hospital?—A. Well, the washing, sawing of the wood—

Q. Do you saw by machinery?—A. Yes, sir; I put a saw there to save wood.

Q. How much coal do you use in getting up steam?—A. Well, sir, it takes a little over two wheelbarrow-loads to do the work of the hospital.

Q. All day?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Can you not give the weight?—A. I can give very near to it. My way of doing is this: A wheelbarrow holds about four hods, and each hod weighs about 50 to 60 pounds. So it is about 200 pounds to the wheelbarrow-load; about 400 pounds I generally use.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. How much of that which you have mentioned do you generally use in getting up steam?—A. I suppose about a wheelbarrow-load would do the pumping of the morning.

Q. In getting up steam, how much?—A. I of course start with wood.

Q. Then you use another wheelbarrow-load after that during the whole day?—A. Yes, sir; two wheelbarrow-loads, I suppose, is about the average as near as I can come to it.

Q. Are those two wheelbarrow-loads more than 100 pounds a day?—A. Yes, sir. A wheelbarrow, as near as I can come to it, as often as I have handled it, holds about four hods—about 200 pounds.

Q. How large is this hod?—A. Number 8, I think. I have weighed the hods and weighed the coal, and that is the way I make the whole calculation.

Q. A hod full of coal weighs how much?—A. A hod full of coal weighs 60 pounds, hod and all.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How many bushels in a hod?—A. I cannot say.

Q. How many do you suppose? Suppose you had a bushel-basket instead of a hod, how would it compare? Does the hod hold as much as the bushel-basket would contain?—A. I do not think it would. I have weighed them on the scales there in the commissary, and the hod and all weighed 60 pounds. I average about 50 pounds, allowing 10 pounds for the hod, and it is a large-sized hod, too.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you pump for the Howard University?—A. I do.

Q. An hour a day?—A. An hour a day.

Q. How much additional coal do you use in that hour?—A. Better than a wheelbarrow, about 300 pounds, I judge.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. In the hour?—A. In the hour. You see it is a pretty good height up there, and there is a heavy body of water ahead of me, and I know it takes twice the quantity of steam to pump up there that it does to do my own ordinary work about here.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You have but an hour; that would be two hours of your ordinary work, two hours of steam. That would not be as much as you speak of, would it?—A. I have to put in a larger fire and keep up a bigger head of steam. My pump will not force up there unless I do.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. I want to understand you about this. You say you use up one wheelbarrow-full in the morning to start your fires?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you think you use about a wheelbarrow and a half for the Howard University?—A. That is the idea.

Q. That takes an hour?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What else do you do during the day except these two things—getting up steam in the morning and pumping for the Howard University during the day?—A. Just keep a light head on for the kitchen and for the wash-house.

Q. How much coal does that take; how many wheelbarrows-full?—A. It would not take any for that. It does not take any, you might say, because the waste steam I have there does it. Ten pounds of steam will suffice.

Q. The steam you have for the Howard University lasts the rest of the day?—A. I have to keep steam on for the kitchen and wash-house all the time.

Q. But you do not use any coal of any amount after you do this hour's pumping, do you?—A. O, yes, sir; I add coal.

Q. How much?—A. In the afternoon I have to fill my tanks after I have done the Howard University.

Q. How much coal do you add then?—A. Near on to a wheelbarrow.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Make any statement you wish to make in reference to your knowledge of matters connected with the Freedmen's Hospital.—A. I would rather not make a voluntary statement. If you want to know anything about the dead bodies, or anything of that kind, or the water—

Q. State anything you know about dead bodies.—A. I can tell you about the dead bodies. I had occasion to complain once in regard to a large hole, about four feet square, I judge, dug in the day-time, particularly over my main water-line, a four-inch pipe.

Q. When was that?—A. Toward the latter part of last year. I cannot give you the day and date.

Q. How deep was it?—A. Dug directly down, so as to expose my water-main.

Q. How deep?—A. I suppose four or five feet.

Q. Was the hole being dug at that time?—A. It was dug then. My attention was called to it, and I came up to ascertain by what authority anybody had done it, or by whose orders this hole was dug or was being dug over my main water-pipes. I did not like anybody to be digging around any of my pipes without my knowledge. I reported it to Dr. Palmer and he said that it would be attended to, or something of that kind. Next morning when I came here the hole was filled up. There were complaints made about bodies down here, and Dr. Palmer came around to the engine-house.

Q. What bodies do you mean?—A. Portions of bodies, or something of that kind, dug up right in front of my engine house.

Q. Do you refer to the head and breast-bones that were referred to by the other witnesses?—A. I saw that.

Q. That is what you refer to?—A. That was part.

Q. What else do you refer to?—A. Dr. Palmer came to me next day with Banks and requested that I should go around and show him where these places were that were spoken of, and he would have them dug up. I took him down and showed him three places. I also took him around to the main water-pipe and said to him, "There is the place there that I complained to you about," that I spoke of in my evidence. Banks spoke up and said, "No, sir; this is not the place; here it is, down here." "Then," said I, "there are two places over my main water-

pipe, and the only way to get at it satisfactorily will be to dig down both places." On a Saturday, I think, he set Banks to work, and he commenced digging. Along the side where this body was dug up was the fresh place.

Q. By "this body" you mean that which I just mentioned?—A. Yes; it had its head cut off, and had no feet.

Q. Any arms?—A. I did not notice. It was too disgusting for me to look at.

Q. I only want to identify the instance, because we have had it fully described by other witnesses.—A. I cannot tell you. Dr. Palmer took a seat alongside my engine-room door, and I took a seat on the opposite side of the door. Potter was going by. He called Potter in and told him something about a letter he had just received, and Potter remained in the engine-room with us. We sat there talking, and when I saw Banks take up a sack-full of something, I did not know what it was, because he would not allow anybody to go down. The railing fence up there was taken away to keep the patients from sitting around there—not to let them go down to see what was up, or anything of the kind. I had orders to take down the fence. The first sack-full that was taken up I directed Dr. Palmer's attention to, and said, "There is one sack-full," and every time I saw a sack or bag I would draw his attention to it.

Q. Was it all in sacks?—A. It was taken up and put in this way (indicating).

Q. Was it in sacks?—A. When he picked it up from the hole and carried it to the dead-house, it was then in a sack or bag, or something of that kind, as much as they could lift.

Q. How many sacks?—A. Three or four, I think.

Q. Three, or four? Which?—A. I cannot say positively. When Dr. Palmer went away, Dr. Purvis and Dr. Glenman went down and staid in the store-room, near the lower place there, and saw the balance of it. I sat around there until it was all dug up.

Q. Is there any other matter you want to make a statement in regard to?—A. I will not make any volunteer statement.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Have you stated to us now all that you have stated hitherto in reference to the hospital?—A. O, no, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Make any statement you have made hitherto, remembering that you are under oath.—A. Exactly. I was asked in regard to using the machinery for this palmetto-paper company.

Q. State what you know about that.—A. I was introduced to a man by the name of Herring, who was brought there for the purpose of experimenting with palmetto for the purpose of making paper.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. When?—A. I do not know the date. I cannot give you dates.

Q. About when?—A. Some time during last year, I think. He introduced Mr. Herring to me.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Who did?—A. Dr. Palmer did. He brought him to the engine-room and wanted me to let him have the machinery to try this experiment with. Palmetto was brought here.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What machinery did he use?—A. It was steaming.

Q. What machinery did he use?—A. The washing-machine.

Q. What was the washing-machine?—A. The washing-machine is composed of a large box, with a drum inside that revolves two revolutions this way and then revolves back again, the clothes being put inside.

Q. It was a washing-machine or tub?—A. A large square box.

Q. Do you call it a tub?—A. Some call it a tub, and some call it a machine, because it goes by machinery. There is a large drum on the inside of it.

Q. Was this in use for any other purpose at that time?—A. For washing.

Q. Was it at that time used for washing?—A. Not at that time. It was a kind of extra one.

Q. Had it been some time before?—A. When one gives out, we take this extra one, as we call it.

Q. Then this one was not in use at that time?—A. No; it was not in use at that time.

Q. Proceed.—A. I did so; the palmetto was brought up, and I steamed it for them, and it was pounded up in the coal-house and taken to the paper-mill in Georgetown.

Q. How was it pounded up in the coal-house? Who pounded it up?—A. One of the nurses pounded it up the first time, and then he had a man here of his own.

Q. Who had?—A. Well, I cannot say whether Dr. Palmer or Mr. Herring.

Q. Did you have an interest in that?—A. I did not.

Q. Did Dr. Palmer advise you not to take an interest in it?—A. He did.

Q. Did you have an offer to go as engineer to Mr. Herring?—A. I did.

Q. Were you considering that offer?—A. Well, I just considered this way, that he was a man who teased me a great deal about it. He said when he got his machinery up he wanted me as an engineer down there, and then afterwards he came to me and wanted to make some other proposals to me in regard to taking stock in it, but I did not see it; I would rather see something, poor man as I was, that I could secure myself on if such a thing was done.

Q. Dr. Palmer advised you not to have anything to do with it?—A. He did, towards the last.

Q. Did he ever advise you differently?—A. No; he never advised me differently.

Q. There was steam used in that box or tub, was there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that waste steam?—A. Not at all; it was the same steam that I do my washing with, or use for other purposes; it came directly from my boiler; that pipe leads from the boiler to do the washing.

Q. How much more coal did you put in?—A. These things I did not calculate to go into.

Q. Did you use any more coal for that purpose?—A. Certainly I used more coal.

Q. How much?—A. I could allow, on a rough guess, about a wheelbarrow-load; I cannot say more than that.

Q. You did use an extra wheelbarrow-load right along?—A. While I was doing that steaming.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How long did that occupy? How long were you engaged in this

steaming that you speak of?—A. I cannot say; it might have taken about a week; I judge about that.

Q. You used a wheelbarrow-load every day for a week?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much time did you occupy in it?—A. I kept steam on there all day.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You keep steam on every day, do you not?—A. Not on that tub. I put steam on that tub, and I could cut it off when I pleased. I had control of my steam, to be sure; I put the steam on there in the mornings, and when it was properly boiled it would be taken out and taken into the coal-house and there pounded, broken up like, and mashed, and then taken off to a paper-mill.

Q. Do you burn an extra wheelbarrow-load of coal for washing purposes on washing-days?—A. On heavy wash-days I do—on Mondays; I guess about that.

Q. How many washing-machines do you run on heavy washing-days?—A. There are two large machines there that I run on washing-days. We have three machines there.

Q. Does it take a wheelbarrow-load extra to a machine?—A. No, sir; I guess not.

Q. Why did it take an extra wheelbarrow-load to this extra machine?—A. Because I kept steam on it all the day long, from morning to night.

Q. Do you not keep the steam on for those washing-machines?—A. Only the time in doing the washing.

Q. How long is that?—A. A half-day on Mondays, and till about eleven o'clock other days; that is, on Wednesdays and Fridays.

Q. What else have you testified about heretofore?—A. It taxes my memory; they had me here so much before. I wanted to let the whole matter drop; I thought it would all have dropped before now.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You say this palmetto business lasted about a week?—A. I think so.

Q. Why was it stopped then?—A. I cannot say, unless it proved a failure; that is all I can tell you; the paper did not turn out well. I saw some of the paper that was made from it, and I suppose it proved to be a failure; that is as near as I can come to it. They boiled all by steam here and took it off. There was enough to satisfy the company that it did not act. That was the last I heard of it.

Q. Did you object to using your steam for that purpose at the time?—A. I did not; I could not do it. I had orders from my superior officers, and I obey whatever they tell me to do. If they told me to take them out I would take them out. I believe principally what they examined me before as near as I can recollect was in regard to the water. They did say something about the vermin business to me on the clothes in washing.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you find vermin on the clothes in the washing?—A. Most undoubtedly. I have seen clothes brought into the wash-house just thrown out off people where the lice were actually creeping all over them.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What sort of clothing?—A. Patients' clothing that come in, where they strip them. As I say now, my way would be when a patient comes in, and comes in that condition, the clothes should be burned up directly. I do not believe there is any salvation for them in boiling them

as anything else. I believe the only fit way is to make a fire under them and burn them up and be done with it, and not allow them to be put in the machine at all.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You think the machines will not kill the vermin ?—A. I do not.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Will not the steam do it ?—A. Steam will do it provided it is put up to a very great heat, but then I do not know if it takes twenty pounds to run the engine whether it would be worth while to put on forty pounds.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You think it would be cheaper to buy new clothes all round ?—A. Most undoubtedly, for the clothes come in that vermined state that they are really not fit for a man to put on again.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Are the patients that come in here generally a pretty hard lot ?—A. Some of them ; some of them are pretty rough. Some of them do not come in here until the lice almost eat them up. That is about the amount of it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. It is a very difficult problem to deal with, what to do with these poor wretched creatures ?—A. I think it is pretty hard to kill a louse, anyhow.

Q. With patients that come in here in the last stages of consumption and covered with vermin, and so forth, it is pretty hard to keep things clean, is it not ?—A. Well, I do not know about that, if they would take the proper course. In the first place, they should strip the man, burn the clothes immediately, and not allow them to lay their clothes here and thus scatter vermin all over the place. That is my idea of it. As soon as it gets warm they will crawl every which way. I know very well, from my being in the wash-house attending the machinery there, that I have actually carried them home on myself from just working in and out of the wash-house.

Q. You think it would be an object for the government to make an appropriation to buy clothing right out and burn this up ?—A. Yes, sir ; burn this up. The clothes are not in condition really, after they are taken off, for the poorest mortal in the world to wear again.

Q. Are the heads of new patients shaved, do you know ?—A. No, sir ; I do not think they are. Sometimes, if the hair gets pretty long through the summer, they cut as close as scissors will cut it ; but I do not think they are trimmed the first thing when they come in. As far as my knowledge goes, the hair is not trimmed when they first come in.

Q. I suppose the lice would be apt to stick to the hair ?—A. They would do it, and to the clothes particularly. That is the main point. My idea of it, as I have said here, is that these clothes ought to be burned right up. There should be something of that kind, because they will spread over the place. I have seen them on clean clothes directly from the laundry-room.

Q. After they have been steamed ?—A. After they have been steamed and ironed ; I have seen them on the clean clothes ; I have seen them myself.

Q. And the only remedy, you think, is to burn them up ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The clothes are sometimes whole, except that they are infected with lice. They would be otherwise good?—A. Yes, sir; some very good come in here; and then again some come in here that is not fit for any purpose at all.

Q. What do they do with those; do they burn them up anyhow?—A. I do not think they burn any up. They all go to the washing-machine. I have seen them carried alongside of the washing-machine and laid down there for 48 hours.

Q. You wash every other day?—A. Every other day. They would be taken there, and if they happened to come after the washing was done they would lie until the next washing-day. If they come Monday after the washing was done they would stay until Wednesday.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Have you ever suggested burning up to anybody?—A. I do not think I have; but that has been my idea.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Why did you not go to one of the officers and suggest it?—A. Well, I will tell you the truth. I did not like to make any complaints or suggestions around the place. I have made a suggestion once in regard to meat.

Q. What suggestion did you make in regard to meat, and when was it?—A. I heard a great deal of complaint, it may be a month before I heard of any trouble or investigation here.

Q. To whom did you make the suggestion?—A. Dr. Glennan, or at least I made a complaint to him about the meat being of such bad quality and so on.

Q. What meat did you refer to?—A. Meat that came directly from the butcher and to the commissary.

Q. Who is the butcher?—A. Mr. Hoover.

Q. Where is his place of business?—A. I think he is in what we term the Marsh Market—the Center Market—the Avenue Market. He has a stand there, and one, I think, in what we term the Coreoran Market. I spoke of the quality of the meat, and drew his attention to it, and he said he would see to it.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. That is Dr. Glennan?—A. Yes, sir; he went in, and when he came out again he said that he had examined the meat and found it of good quality, and that I should be very careful in making my reports; that I should not say anything about it.

Q. Who is the commissary you speak of?—A. A man named Chapman; some call him steward.

Q. He is the man who receives all the meat?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. In a memorandum sent to us there was something said about some pipe. Do you know about that?—A. I was asked in regard to my doing work outside for private parties; I was asked for whom I had done this work. I stated that I had done work for Dr. Palmer and Dr. Glennan, and also for Dr. Purvis. I was asked what work I had done; I told that I had set a fountain in front of Dr. Palmer's house, and done other jobs there, besides some houses south of the Capitol that he owned; cutting and running water-pipe, setting hydrant, &c. I was asked what work I had done for Dr. Glennan; I had run sewers, and one house I had fitted up with gas; but I must say as far as Dr. Glen-

nan is concerned, and that gas business, I am satisfied he paid for his pipe any more than my time and labor there.

Q. How long did you work for Dr. Palmer?—A. Off and on, I suppose—

Q. Altogether?—A. I would leave here in the morning, get in the wagon, go down, and stay two-thirds of the day down there.

Q. How many times did you do that?—A. About three times down to his house, I think, and then I was taken in an ambulance down to these houses south of the Capitol, what we call Howard's Row down there. I was about a day and a half down there, I judge, at one time.

Q. Altogether three days?—A. I judge about that.

Q. Did you ever present a bill for it?—A. Not at all.

Q. Why not?—A. I do not like to send a bill. I was here; he ordered me to do it, and I did it. I could not send in a bill, and did not think I would have a right to.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Who did your work here when you were down there?—A. Sometimes the nurse would be called out to look after my boiler.

Q. You generally did your work here before going there?—A. Yes, sir; I would come over here and get things all straight apparently, and then I would leave him to look out for the boiler. I ran some water-pipe for Dr. Purvis at his house.

Q. How long were you doing that?—A. I guess I was not more than half a day doing that.

Q. Did he pay you for it?—A. Now, to say whether he paid me for it or not—I sawed his wood for him by the machinery here, and when Christmas came he sent me a turkey. I do not know what it was for, now, to tell the truth about it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. How long were you sawing the wood?—A. I think I sawed in all about three cords for him, in five or six pieces.

Q. You said something about a piece of pipe that you used at Dr. Palmer's. How long a piece of pipe did you use?—A. A two-inch piece of pipe, about eight feet long; eight or ten feet, something in that neighborhood.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Did you take it from here?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. To whom did it belong; the University or the Hospital?—A. That is a question. When I came here, eight years ago, there was no pipe on the place. This two-inch pipe, I believe, then was under the Bureau of Freedmen, Refugees and Abandoned Lands. Whether that was the government or Howard University I cannot say.

Q. Was this building standing then?—A. This building was standing then.

Q. Belonging to the Howard University?—A. I judge so.

Q. Were the premises then hired of the Howard University?—A. That I cannot say. The building known as ward number one and ward number two has been built since I came here. It was built partly out of what we term the brown house down below.

Q. Was that on the premises that belonged to the Howard University?—A. It was at that time, but a great portion of it has been sold since.

Q. It belonged to the Howard University?—A. It did at that time.

Q. You are not able to say whether at that time the government rented of the Howard University or not?—A. I am not able to say anything about that.

Q. Do you know now whether it does or not?—A. To the best of my belief it is rented. I understand there is an appropriation of \$2,000 rent for it.

Q. All the property here belongs to the Howard University, does it not, but is rented by the government?—A. That is what I cannot say; that is something I never went into; but this pipe I was speaking of. I was to fit up this ward with steam, water, and gas. That was the understanding. I do not know how many hundred dollars it cost, but I made an estimate of the amount of pipe and so on. The pipe was cut, and there was some difficulty because Mr. Evans and Mr. Shepherd did not get the job, and the pipe never was put in. This was at the time that Colonel Brown was quartermaster for the Bureau of Freedmen, Refugees and Abandoned Lands, I think. The pipe remained in my engine-room, and this was a piece of that pipe.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You do not know to whom it belonged?—A. I will not say positively who that belonged to. I cannot.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Are you a plumber?—A. I believe I am.

Q. A gas-fitter by trade?—A. Not by trade. I am an engineer, but I have done all the gas-fitting, and the plumbing, and everything, without a dollar's expense to the government in the last eight years in this place, where they were paying hundreds of dollars for plumbing here every month before that.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. During how long a time have you been doing that?—A. About eight years.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Who does the plumbing now?—A. I do all the plumbing and all the repairing and everything about the place at the present time.

Q. Since the last of June just as before?—A. Just as before.

Q. There has been simply a reduction of your wages, then?—A. That was all. I was allowed that \$30 for my services in keeping the plumbers out of here and keeping the place in repair.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Since last June they have taken away from you that \$30?—A. Yes, sir. I still go on the same as I did before.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. What was the reason given for that?—A. Because the Appropriation Committee only put in \$60 for an engineer.

Q. Therefore they could not pay you any more?—A. Therefore; but I have always been receiving since I came here \$60; that was the understanding; and they gave me the \$30 for my services in keeping the pipes, &c., in repair.

Q. You think you ought to have the extra \$30?—A. I do most undoubtedly. I should be very glad to get it about this time, as it has brought me down almost to want.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is there any other statement you wish to make?—A. Nothing.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Who first notified you that your \$30 was taken from you?—A. I do not know but what I saw it in the papers, and then we had a talk about it. I know we had a general conversation.

Q. Whom did you talk with? Dr. Palmer, do you mean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he tell you then that it was impossible for him to pay you any more than the \$60 because that was all that the government allowed?—A. Yes, sir; I think he did tell me that.

Q. Did you find any fault with him for it?—A. I do not know that I found any fault with him personally at all. I thought it was a very hard thing, for I had to do the plumbing, and I was advised not to let any other plumber come in here, for it would be the means of losing my place. I thought half a loaf was better than no bread. I thought I had better go on and trust to getting, perhaps, my \$30 back again, or getting an understanding as to myself here.

Q. A great deal of fault has been found with a certain water-closet in one of the wards—ward number two, I think. Did you take down that water-closet?—A. I took down part of it.

Q. At whose order, or was it at your own suggestion as a plumber that it was necessary to be done?—A. The idea is this—

Q. Answer the question first, and not with any idea. Did you do it by an order of one of the officers, or was it from your own knowledge as a plumber that it was necessary to do it?—A. I had orders to repair a water-closet in ward number two.

Q. From whom?—A. From one of the doctors.

Q. Which one?—A. I cannot say positively now whether it was Dr. Glennan or Dr. Palmer; one of the two.

Q. As a matter of fact, was not Dr. Palmer absent at that time, so that the order was given by Dr. Glennan?—A. That is just as I say; I do not know positively, but I am of the opinion that it was Dr. Glennan that gave me the order.

Q. Now, what was the order?—A. The order was to repair that water-closet.

Q. Then it was out of order, was it?—A. It was out of order.

Q. Had you examined it before, and notified the physician that it was necessary to repair that closet?—A. Well, I was notified by Dr. Glennan, I think, as near as I can come to it, to repair that water-closet. I knew nothing of it previous to that. It was a patent water-closet, and the hinge of the basin had become broken. I took off the remaining part of the hinge, got an order from Dr. Glennan, sent it down to Somerville's, the brass man's, and they kept it there two or three days. When it came back it came back with the understanding that he could not repair that. I immediately reported. There was no more notice taken of it at all. I told him I could not do it unless I had these things to do it with; if he gave me these things I could do it here. They sent word back that they could not do this. It went on for some time, a week or ten days, I judge; no notice was taken of it until Dr. Palmer came to me.

Q. Had he not been absent?—A. I know he was away. I cannot say whether it was that time or not.

Q. He came to you, anyhow?—A. Yes, sir. Until this disturbance

was going on, I knew nothing of it. He commenced blaming me as being the cause of all this disturbance.

Q. What do you mean by "all this disturbance"; about the water-closet, you mean, I suppose?—A. They had a little private consultation over in the room there, in ward number two.

Q. Did he complain to you that you had taken the water-closet out, and that it was your fault that it was not put in repair again? Was that the complaint?—A. That was the complaint he made to me.

Q. Then what was done?—A. I told him directly what had been done. "Well," said he, "you ought to have reported to me." I could not report to him if he was out of the city.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Then he was out of the city at that time?—A. I judge so, as near as I can come to it.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. What did you do then, or what did he order then?—A. He said, "It must be fixed some way or other." Said I, "I do not know any way except to send off to the manufactnrer, or take the whole thing out and put in an old second-hand one," that would answer as we could not repair that one. I came down in the basement, here, where there were some extra ones, and I took one of these old water-closets, repaired it, fixed it up, and put it in there.

Q. As soon as possible after you got that order?—A. Most undoubtedly. As soon as that was done I went to work and fixed it right up. There were no urinals around. There used to be two, and I recollect putting them up myself. One happened to remain in the women's ward for a long time, until I spoke of it; and as they would not have any use for it I spoke of taking it out of there. Since this thing, I have put up urinals all around in the men's wards, and fixed up generally all around.

Q. You did it by order of Dr. Palmer?—A. O yes, sir; by order of Dr. Palmer.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do you know anything about boiling human bones?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you know about that?—A. I have had bones sent down to me at the engine-house to boil for the purpose of getting the grease out of them. I have done it.

Q. For whom?—A. It has been some time ago.

Q. Who sent them down to you?—A. The students. I do not think Dr. Palmer or Dr. Glennan would send those things down there.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Did they know it?—A. I think they did.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Why do you think so?—A. Because I was boiling them at the time they came into the engine-house.

Q. What were these bones; remains of dissections?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Bones that the students wanted to preserve for specimens?—A. I judged that was what it was for.

Q. In what would you boil them?—A. I would get a kettle, or a tin pan, or something, and put in a little water and a little soda, and turn the steam on, and boil them in that way.

Q. How often did you do that?—A. As often as half a dozen times, I suppose.

Q. What bones would come?—A. Arm-bones, I judge.

Q. These were sent by students for the purpose of preserving as specimens?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. You say that was some time ago. When was it?—A. I do not think it was in Dr. Palmer's time. I do not think it has been done in his time at all.

Q. It was before his time?—A. I think it was before Dr. Palmer's time. I never kept any data of it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Under Dr. Reyburn?—A. In Dr. Reyburn's time.

Q. Are you in the habit of coming in here into this room [the surgeon's room]?—A. I do not know. Yes, I come in the morning.

Q. Do you ever take letters out of this room?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever take a letter out of here?—A. Never.

Q. Nor give it or show it to any one?—A. I have not done it.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. You have not done it within a day or two?—A. No, sir; I have not.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Did Robert Johnson read a letter to you from Secretary Schurz assuring you that you would be kept in your place if you would testify in this matter?—A. No, sir; I went down to Secretary Schurz myself in regard to this kukluxing the engine-room doors and kukluxing the ambulances and the commissary doors.

Q. Explain yourself. What do you mean by kukluxing? Who was doing it?—A. Somebody did it at night-time and hung crape to my door, and I complained about that.

Q. Who did it?—A. I cannot say. It was done in the night-time.

Q. Who did you suppose did it?—A. I cannot say. All I can say is this, that I said we had a watchman at the gate and I thought it was a very singular thing that a watchman at the gate protecting government property should allow this thing to be done right underneath his nose.

Q. Might it not be done by some patient getting out of the hospital?—A. Certainly a watchman passing, coming right to the commissary door, should know it.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Who is the watchman?—A. His name was Wall, at that time. He was discharged directly afterward.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You got no letter and none was read to you by Mr. Johnson?—A. I got none, I am positive.

Q. Then if Mr. Johnson says the reason you testified in this matter was that he read to you a letter of that kind from Secretary Schurz, he is mistaken?—A. He is certainly mistaken as regards any letter being written in that way at all, or any letter of that style being written.

Q. Did you call upon a woman by the name of Nachtman, about two weeks ago, or at any time, to try to get her to testify against the hospital?—A. I did not; I never called upon her for that purpose at all.

Q. Did you tell her you had been to see Secretary Schurz and he had promised to retain you, even if the Senate committee did not find against Dr. Palmer?—A. No, sir; I never said anything of that kind.

Q. Have you had meetings at your house for the purpose of getting up evidence against Dr. Palmer?—A. I have not.

Q. Or to get him removed?—A. Not in regard to getting him removed at all.

Q. In reference to getting up testimony against him?—A. No, sir. Well, some of my friends have come there.

Q. What friends?—A. Dr. Augusta came there.

Q. Who else?—A. Mr.—let me see if I can recollect. Mr. Wall was at my house once.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. The watchman?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Who is this Mr. Wall?—A. O. S. B. Wall, 'Squire Wall.

Q. Was he the man who furnished milk to the hospital formerly?—A. I judge so.

Q. They do not take milk of him now?—A. Of his brother.

Q. He lives in this neighborhood, does he not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who else?—A. Mr. McFarland came to my house once.

Q. On that errand?—A. No, sir; not on that errand.

Q. You know what I am talking about?—A. I cannot say any of them came in regard to that.

Q. I ask if there was not a consultation at your house for the purpose of getting up evidence against Dr. Palmer?—A. None, none whatever, for the purpose of getting up evidence against Dr. Palmer.

Q. What did Mr. Wall come there for?—A. That has been some time ago. I shall have to think.

Q. In reference to this investigation?—A. There may have been something said about the investigation, most undoubtedly.

Q. Was that the purpose of the consultation?—A. There may have been something said about it.

Q. What was said about it?—A. That I cannot say; just an off-hand conversation.

Q. Did Dr. Augusta come for the same purpose?—A. No; he came to hear what had been done or what was doing, and so on.

Q. You know Robert T. Johnson, a colored man in ward 2, do you not?—A. If you mean the one who is in the ward here, I know him.

Q. Is he the one formerly connected with the fire department of the city?—A. That I do not know of my own knowledge.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You have tried to be faithful here during all your service?—A. I have.

Q. Are you any more so now than formerly?—A. Just as much so.

Q. You are faithful and diligent and have always tried to be so?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You always intended to do your duty, I presume. In other words, did the recent investigation make any difference in your mode of doing your duty? Have you done it any better latterly than you did six months ago?—A. I have done it just the same.

Q. Then you can answer the question. I only want a truthful answer you did it as well before?—A. Yes, sir.

MARY ANN BANKS (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a nurse in the hospital?—Answer. I am.

Q. In what ward?—A. Dr. Palmer's.

Q. How long have you been nurse?—A. I do not know exactly, but I have been here some time.

Q. Some years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you here under Dr. Reyburn?—A. I was.

Q. What is the character of the patients received? In what condition do they come?—A. Some of them come very dirty, and some of them, of course, come tolerably clean.

Q. You are in a female ward, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they have vermin on them?—A. Sometimes on their heads and bodies, too.

Q. What do you do with them?—A. We take them right off. When they come we bathe them and have their clothes washed. Sometimes the clothes are so bad we cannot do it and we burn them up, and then the doctor gives them clothes.

Q. Do you know of clothes that are too dirty to be washed being burned?—A. Sometimes when they are very ragged and buggy, not worth washing, they are burned.

Q. Where are they burned?—A. We burn them up in the stove in the ward. They do not have anything on them sometimes but two pieces when they come in.

Q. What is the food of the patients in your ward?—A. They have for regular diet beef and potatoes and flour, bread or corn-bread, whichever they request, and if they want anything extra, of course they ask it and the doctor gives us a special order for it. Then they get chicken once or twice a week, and soup.

Q. How is the food cooked?—A. Well, I cannot say much about that. If the patients send for something special, of course it is cooked very well; they do it up particular; sometimes it is done very well, and sometimes patients find fault with it and say it is not good. Then I want to know what is the trouble. They say, "We cannot eat this," and then I get something else to eat for them. That is all I know.

Q. Do you notice, when they complain, whether it is the fault of the food or of the stomach?—A. I think it is from sickness, because it is good, and if I see anything that is not right, I speak to the doctor and it is fixed right.

Q. Is the cooking now about the same as it was two or three years ago?—A. Yes, sir; about the same.

Q. Are the articles of food about the same?—A. Yes, sir, the very same.

Q. There has been no change, to your knowledge?—A. No, sir; I do not think there is. We have pork sometimes; sometimes we have beef; and we have fish; sometimes mackerel and sometimes cod-fish, and in fresh-fish season we have fresh fish.

Q. Do you always have?—A. Yes, sir; always.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Was it so under the other doctor?—A. Yes, sir; under the other doctor, and also under this one, Dr. Palmer.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What is the quality of the mackerel, for instance?—A. They have

been having number one mackerel. They are good mackerel; large number one.

Q. Are they the same kind they have always had?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And ever since Dr. Palmer has been here?—A. Yes, sir; only once I believe they were not good, and the doctor saw to it.

Q. His attention was called to it, and he saw that they had better?—A. Yes, sir; when they spoke of it, of course it was reported to the doctor, and then he saw that it was made better.

Q. And they had better after that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They had better before that?—A. Yes, sir; it was only once that I remember to say that they complained.

Q. What is the character of the white bread; is it sour or good?—A. Sometimes it was found sour in warm weather; but after it was spoken about it was sent away and it was seen that it was good, and of course that was when Dr. Rayburn was here, too. They would find fault with the bread and he would see that it was not so.

Q. What is the quality of the corn-bread?—A. The corn-bread is just made plain.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Hoe-cake?—A. No, sir; not hoe-cake. It is all baked together and then cut up.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is it good corn-bread?—A. Good.

Q. Is it any better now than it used to be?—A. No, sir; about the same.

Q. What is the quality of the hominy?—A. The hominy is generally very good.

Q. Has it always been?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Generally, you state it is the same now that it has been?—A. Yes, sir; generally the same.

Q. What do you do about cleaning your ward?—A. I clean the ward once a week these short days; when the weather is warm, two or three days in a week; and every day around the stove where it is needed and between the beds; and it is swept out every day and kept clean.

Q. How was it last August?—A. I do not know; I suppose about the same. I do the same business there every day.

Q. And you have done so for several years?—A. Yes, sir. Sometimes I have had to scrub Sundays just the same as any other day.

Q. How often do you change the bedding?—A. The bed all the way through once a week; and when I have a really sick patient I change it any time it is needed, if it is two or three times a day.

Q. How often do you change the clothes of the patients?—A. Once a week.

Q. Do you give them clean clothes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you always do that?—A. Always did it.

Q. What do you do when a person dies in the ward?—A. Wash them, lay them out, and call for the watchman to come and bring the stretcher and carry them out to the dead-house.

Q. Do you wash them in the ward?—A. Wash and dress them in the ward.

Q. Do you dress them with clean clothes?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How many patients have you in a ward generally?—A. I could

not tell you exactly how many there are, but I guess somewhere over twenty-five at present.

Q. Is that about the usual number or do they grow more?—A. It grows more and more, because we have got rid of some, and as fast as we get rid of some more come in.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You think you have rather more now than you used to have?—A. No, sir; we always have been pretty full. It has been so full that I did not have beds enough to supply them, and would have to put them in another ward.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Are these all colored patients?—A. No, sir; we have two white girls. We have had several.

HENRY SANDERS (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with the hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir; in Dr. Parvis's ward; assistant nurse of ward No. 2.

Q. How long have you been nurse in the hospital?—A. Ever since the 1st of last May.

Q. You were here through the summer and you have been here down to the present time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. In the mess-house.

Q. Do you know about the food that is served up in the mess-room?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you have for breakfast there now?—A. Beef and hominy, in the morning for breakfast, and eggs.

Q. Did you have the same last May?—A. O, yes, sir; we had the same last May.

Q. Did you have the same articles?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you have meat for breakfast then?—A. Yes, sir; and some mornings fish.

Q. Did the patients have the same?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They ate the same food as the nurses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was the meat?—A. The meat was tolerable; kind of salt, sometimes, the meat is.

Q. You refer to the salt meat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was the fresh meat?—A. The fresh meat is just the same; sometimes a little tainted in warm weather.

Q. How was it generally?—A. Most generally the same thing right along through.

Q. Do you mean good or bad?—A. Good. Sometimes patients will make complaints anyhow.

Q. But you are not a patient; and I want to know what the fact is, not whether they complain.—A. I will just tell the truth.

Q. That is what I want.—A. We all complain, sometimes, about the meat being so salty, and think we could get better.

Q. How is the food cooked?—A. Cooked sometimes pretty bad.

Q. "Sometimes." How often?—A. Most generally along so. It is not so well cooked as it ought to be.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Not done enough?—A. Not done enough. Sometimes the meat would not be quite done.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You say that sometimes it was not done ?—A. Sometimes.

Q. As a rule was it not done ?—A. Not all the time ; just sometimes ; now and then.

Q. Once a week, or twice a week ?—A. Once a week.

Q. What kind of bread do you get ?—A. We get loaf-bread.

Q. But what kind of bread, good or bad ?—A. Good bread.

Q. Was it sour ?—A. Once or twice it was kind of sour, just once or twice. We made a statement to the doctor about it and got better bread.

Q. What is the treatment of the patients by the physicians in your ward ?—A. Dr. Purvis, as long as I have been under him, has treated them very well. If they ask anything, he generally gives it to them if they have it to give.

Q. Does he inspect the ward regularly ?—A. Yes, sir ; every day.

Q. Does he inspect the water-closets as well as the rest ?—A. Yes, sir ; every morning when he comes through he looks at the water-closet.

Q. What do you do toward cleansing your ward and your water-closet ?—A. We wash with soap and soda to cleanse the floor.

Q. How do you clean the water-closet ; in the same way ?—A. Yes, sir ; we scrub up good.

Q. Are the patients careless in the water-closet ?—A. Very careless. We have always to tell them about being careful.

Q. Is it a great deal of trouble to get them straight ?—A. Yes, sir ; a good deal.

Q. Do you ever change the beds ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often ?—A. We change the beds every Monday ; give clean sheets and pillow-cases.

Q. Suppose a patient defiles the bed, what do you do then ?—A. We take that off and put a clean one on.

Q. A mattress ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you do about the underclothing of the patients ?—A. We change that every Friday, take them off ; and if the clothes are any way dirty we change before ; we put on clean clothes throughout.

Q. Did you do that last May, June, July, and August ?—A. We did it ; when we found anything wrong we always cleaned them.

Q. Did you do the same last summer in these particulars as you do now ?—A. Yes, sir ; all the way through the summer.

Q. Is the man named Felton a patient in your ward ?—A. Yes, sir ; a pretty rapid one.

Q. What do you mean by rapid ?—A. A cuss man. He called me a son of a bitch many times.

Q. You say he is profane ?—A. Yes, sir ; he is. He called me a black son of a bitch. He said Dr. Purvis was a son of a bitch, and told me to tell him so.

Q. Was that on account of any ill treatment of yourself to him ?—A. Not a bit. I do the very best I could for him. I only came into the ward and went around his bed, and he drove me away from the bed, and told me he did not want so black a son of a bitch around him ; that I was only a spy anyhow. If he had been anything of a man, I would have went for him.

Q. Were you spying anything at all ?—A. No more than attending to my business, as I generally do.

Q. What did you go there for ?—A. I went to get one of the jugs out, to empty it.

Q. Mr. Potter is a patient in your ward ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Potter testified to something in reference to his discharge. Do you know the cause of Mr. Potter's discharge?—A. I do.

Q. What was it?—A. He was discharged for misconduct in the ward. He was cussing about the grub he was getting. I told him I could do no better and I would tell the doctor. He was getting very good grub. He was kind of poorly, and said "Take this G—d damned grub out of here, I'll not eat this damned mess." I said "Mr. Potter, you should not cuss like that; I will complain to the doctor about your cussing so in the ward." He said "Do it." I did complain to the doctor about his cussing in the ward; I thought it my duty to tell the doctor of anything going on wrong.

Q. Did he curse in the presence of the doctor to your knowledge?—A. Never in the presence of the doctor; none of them do it in the presence of the doctor.

Q. For that reason the doctor discharged him?—A. Yes, sir; I suppose so.

Q. Are you there in the day-time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you do about the towels of patients? How many towels do they have?—A. Patients, more or less, have a towel at every bed ever since the investigation commenced, but not before that.

Q. How was it before that?—A. They had to get them just as they could.

Q. How many towels did they have to a ward?—A. I did not take it down to find out how many, but I think there are seventy-five beds in the ward, and we hang towels up outside for men to wipe on that can walk about, and then we have towels, for men who cannot walk, at the side of the beds.

Q. How was it before the investigation?—A. Two or three towels to a ward.

Q. For how many men?—A. Sometimes all the beds would be full.

Q. How many would that be; thirty?—A. Yes, sir; about that.

Q. Would you have but two or three towels for thirty men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often were the towels changed?—A. Almost any time when they would want them.

Q. You would change them at least once a day?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then you were rather scant in the matter of towels?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Once in two days?—A. Sometimes it would be three days before we changed them.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did your towels get very dirty?—A. Sometimes they would. When we would find them very dirty we would get clean ones.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Who manages the towel part of the business?—A. The first nurse, Lucius Hawkins, or Harcomb. He is the man who sees to the towels.

Q. Can he get towels when he wants them?—A. Yes, sir; he can get them when he wants them now.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you know of his applying for towels and not getting them?—A. I do not.

Q. You do not know of any complaint being made by him that he could not get towels?—A. No, sir; I never heard him say so.

Q. Was Mr. Felton informing witnesses as to what they should testify to in your presence?—A. He did not inform any in my presence. I do not go close to him when he is talking; I do not like to have anything to do with him.

MARY ATKINS (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you a nurse in one of the wards?—Answer. Yes, sir; ward 3.

Q. Is that a female ward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. For two years.

Q. What is the condition of the patients when they are brought into your ward?—A. Some are very dirty.

Q. Do they have vermin on them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you do with them?—A. When they are very dirty and lousy we take them and burn up their clothes. They are washed thoroughly, and clean clothes put on them.

Q. Has that been done ever since you have been here?—A. I have done that ever since I have been here.

Q. What is the food of the patients in your ward?—A. The food now is very good.

Q. What is the food?—A. We have beef and potatoes, or turnips or cabbage. Anybody that wants extras gets them; corn-starch, they get that; eggs, they get them.

Q. You say it is now very good; what is the difference between now and formerly?—A. Well, of course, generally when there was complaining the meat was not good.

Q. When was that, two years ago or one year ago?—A. About a year ago last summer the meat was tainted once or twice.

Q. That was the cause of complaint?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any other cause of complaint?—A. No, sir; I always heard them say they got enough.

Q. And always good enough?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Except that once or twice a year ago last summer when it was tainted?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that what you mean?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Did you tell any one about that?—A. Yes, sir; I told the doctor when he came to me.

Q. What did he say?—A. He said he would have it attended to.

Q. Was it attended to?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Where do you eat; in the ward or in the mess-room?—A. I eat in the mess-room.

Q. What food do you get in the mess-room?—A. Friday morning we have fish, mackerel, for breakfast; Friday dinner we have mackerel. The rest of the days we have meat, roast beef and potatoes and turnips or cabbages.

Q. Do the patients that eat in the mess-room have the same food?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they have enough?—A. Yes, sir; I have heard them say they had enough; I never heard any of them grumbling.

Q. Do you get enough yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much bread do you get?—A. There are plates of bread put on the table.

Q. Do you see the mess-table of the patients?—A. Yes, sir; a plate of bread is put by the patient's plate.

Q. How much?—A. Sometimes one slice; sometimes corn-bread; one piece of corn-bread.

Q. Suppose they want more bread, do they get it?—A. If they want more, the gentleman who attends to the mess-room gives it to them. I have seen him do that myself.

Q. How often do you change the clothes of the patients?—A. Once a week, generally. That is, the regular changing day is once a week; but if I want clothes during the week for the sickest, I get them every day.

Q. Has that been so during the last two years, ever since you have been here?—A. It has been so ever since I have been here. Whatever I call for for a sick patient, I get.

Q. What do you do about cleaning your ward?—A. The wards are cleaned thoroughly once a week.

Q. In what way?—A. Scrubbed; and then along through the week they are mopped around the beds and stoves every other morning.

Q. Do you clean the water-closets?—A. Yes, sir; the water-closets are cleaned every day.

Q. Has that been so during the last two years?—A. Yes, sir; I have done it ever since I have been here.

Q. Are you a day-nurse?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who is the night-nurse of your ward?—A. We have not any night-nurse in the ward.

Q. Do you sleep in the ward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are the patients very sick in your ward?—A. I have some very sick. I have been having some very sick. I have an old lady now there that is very sick.

Q. Do you have help from those patients who are convalescent?—A. Yes, sir; but there is not any patient in there now able to help me. The assistant nurse is there with me all day long. At nights I have to get up and see to patients.

Q. You get up at night when there is any call?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often did you get up last night?—A. Last night I staid up with her until after twelve o'clock, and then I laid down.

Q. Did you sleep all the rest of the night?—A. I had to get up two or three times. Then I got up about five o'clock this morning.

Q. You have to work pretty hard?—A. Yes, sir; I have to do something to make a living.

Q. Have they had any night-nurse in the ward since you have been here?—A. Yes, sir; there is an old lady down there named Caroline. She used to be night-nurse up-stairs, but she has been sick this last month past.

Q. You think there ought to be a regular night-nurse, do you or do you not?—A. Yes, sir; I think there ought to be a regular night-nurse. The doctor has not got one yet. They told me he would get one.

Q. What wages do you get?—A. Eight dollars a month.

Q. And your board?—A. Yes, sir.

NATHAN STREET (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a nurse?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. In what ward?—A. No. 1.

Q. Who is the doctor?—A. Dr. Gleunan.

Q. What do you do to keep your ward clean?—A. We scrub it out twice a week.

Q. Anything else?—A. Yes, sir, we keep the privies all clean; and very often, on account of sickness, three times a week, according to the weather.

Q. How often do you change the clothes of the patients?—A. We generally change them once a week; but the beds, if we have a great many sick cases, we change sometimes twice or three times a week, according to the sickness. The regular changing day is Friday for washing and cleaning patients and changing them.

Q. In changing the beds, you refer to the sheets and pillow-cases?—A. We change them Monday morning.

Q. Suppose a patient dirties his bed, what do you do with that?—A. Clean them, take another bed, and change them. If it is twice or three times a day, we attend to them.

Q. Are the patients that come in dirty or lousy?—A. Sometimes; but as soon as they get in once we clean them.

Q. What do you do with their clothes?—A. We have them washed out and packed away in the baggage room.

Q. Suppose the clothes are excessively dirty, lousy, and ragged, what do you do then?—A. If they are so we cannot make anything of them, we just throw them out.

Q. Where do you throw them?—A. Take and throw them on the pile. In case they are very dirty and ragged, so that we cannot make any use of them, we throw them out. Some come in that way, very ragged.

Q. Where do you throw them?—A. We take and throw them on the ash-pile, not around the ward.

Q. Where is the ash-pile?—A. Out by the stable it used to be, but is not now. We used to carry it around on the common.

Q. You carry it away from the hospital?—A. Of course, outside, on the common.

Q. How do you take care of your water-closets?—A. We scrub and clean them out every day. They are looked to every day.

Q. Are the patients dirty about water-closets?—A. Not at all. Before we had any urinals there, they used to get pretty bad. Some men passed the water on the privy. They did not have any urinals to pass it in.

Q. Since urinals are put in, the water-closets are more easily kept clean?—A. Kept in style. They were kept in as good style as we could before.

Q. How long have you been so particular about keeping your ward clean?—A. We have been particular about that, to my knowing, ever since I have been here, and before I came, I suppose. I have been here about six years myself. I have always been particular about it.

Q. Have you been in that ward all the time?—A. I was in this old ward before that was built, and then there all the time.

Q. Were you as particular as that last August?—A. Just as particular as that last August, every bit.

Q. And before that?—A. Before that, too. I was so all the time. About the sick cases we have on hand, we always generally look to those cases in here. If they are any way filthy at all, we clean them two or three times a day. We never leave anything in the urinal at all.

Q. And never did?—A. No, never.

Q. What kind of food do the patients get?—A. They get pretty good

food, so far as I could say; bacon, and beef, fish, and tea, and coffee, and chicken-soup, and chicken.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. I eat in the dining-room.

Q. There is a table there for the patients also, is there not?—A. For the nurses.

Q. And the patients eat there?—A. When we go in there the patients have gone out. We all eat in one room.

Q. Have you ever been there when the patients were eating?—A. Yes, I go in sometimes not to my meals but passing through.

Q. Do you see whether they have the same food you do?—A. I cannot split the difference.

Q. The same things, as far as you can see?—A. As far as I can see or say, they have the same things.

Q. What kind of food do you get yourself?—A. I get fish and meat.

Q. What do you have for breakfast?—A. Meat throughout the week, and Friday morning they have fish. Sometimes Friday morning they have both fish and meat, and biscuit.

Q. Is the bread sweet, generally?—A. I cannot say anything against the bread.

Q. How is the corn-bread?—A. Very good.

Q. The hominy?—A. Pretty good, as far as I can see or say.

Q. Mackerel?—A. I cannot say anything against the eating now at all.

Q. You are satisfied with the food you get?—A. I am satisfied with the food now. I cannot say anything against it.

Q. How was it formerly?—A. It was most generally as I tell you about the eating; you may speak a little hard about it formerly, but I come as nigh to it as I know.

Q. How was it a year or two ago?—A. Now a year or two ago, I may say, I cannot say so much about that. The eating has been pretty much the same thing since I have been here, except before this committee met there was an alteration made. Then the eating was not as good as since the committee has been here. It has been a little different since the committee took the case in hand.

Q. What difference? What did you have for breakfast before?—A. Meat and fish, as I told you a while ago.

Q. Before the committee came?—A. We had meat and fish, before the committee met, for breakfast. I did say about having meat. We always had meat the whole time round, and on Friday morning we most generally had fish, and sometimes meat, too, with it.

Q. Did you have that last summer and last winter?—A. Last summer and last winter, too, we had it.

Q. That is one of the things the committee want to find out about, because it has been very positively sworn that it is only within the last two or three months that you ever had any meat for breakfast.—A. I cannot come to any such point as that. I must come to the truth. I can say that we have had meat ever since I have been here, except Fridays.

Q. Then tell me what the difference is between the food during the last two or three months and the food during the year before that.—A. The difference is, as far as I could say, that last year the meat was a little different. It is true that sometimes they had some tainted meat.

Q. How often?—A. We had that, I think, once or twice, as nigh as I can come to it.

Q. Was that in the summer time?—A. That was along about summer, I think; I am not positive.

Q. With the exception of once or twice tainted meat, is there any other difference between the food of the present and that time?—A. I have not seen any other difference at all. I state the case as nigh as I possibly can.

JAMES HURD (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with the hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. As nurse?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been?—A. Near seven years now.

Q. In what ward?—A. Ward No. 6.

Q. Who is the physician of that ward?—A. Dr. Glennan.

Q. That is a male ward, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the condition of the patients when they are brought into the ward; are they clean or dirty?—A. Dirty when they are brought in.

Q. Is there generally vermin on them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the condition of their clothes generally?—A. My ward is old folks' ward. I do not get many patients, only once and awhile I get an old man.

Q. Your patients are those that have been here a long while?—A. Yes, sir; the old folks.

Q. The ones that were left here by the original Freedmen's Bureau?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. All colored?—A. All colored. My ward is not a sick-ward. It is the old folks' ward.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What do you do to keep it clean?—A. We generally clean it up, scrub it, and the clothes are washed and changed every week. The clothing and the sheets and the pillow-slips are changed once a week. The ward is scrubbed twice a week, and sometimes three times. It is scrubbed every day if it gets dirty. It is generally scrubbed twice or three times a week.

Q. How long have you been in the habit of paying so much attention to cleaning it?—A. Ever since I had charge of the ward.

Q. Do you make any difference now from what you formerly did in that respect?—A. Not about cleaning.

Q. In any other respect do you make any difference?—A. No, sir; I have not made a difference about cleaning the ward more than what I did from the beginning.

Q. Do you make any difference about attention about patients, to your old men? Do you attend to them now as you used to do?—A. Just the same I always did.

Q. What is the food of the patients?—A. The food I generally carry to them. A great many of them go to the mess-house table or dining-room. I only carry eleven diets on the tray.

Q. You carry eleven diets on the tray and the rest go to the mess-house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you carry on the tray?—A. Beef, bacon, mutton, chicken and chicken-soup, and rice sometimes, hominy, stewed peaches for supper sometimes, sometimes stewed apples, and sometimes canned peaches.

Q. What did you use to carry a year ago?—A. About the same in that ward.

Q. Was it cooked the same?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever see your folks eating in the mess-room?—A. Yes, sir; I have been in the mess-room sometimes when they were eating.

Q. What did they have to eat?—A. I have seen them have at dinner-time cabbage, sometimes beans, beef.

Q. What did they have for breakfast?—A. At breakfast I have seen them have hash, hominy sometimes, and rice. I never was in there much—in the dining-room, at eating time.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. I eat in the dining-room, at the nurses' table.

Q. Did they seem to have the same food and of the same kind that you had?—A. No, sir.

Q. What was the difference?—A. The food is not fixed on their table like it is on ours.

Q. Give us the difference.—A. The food we have of course is set on in dishes, and theirs is set on in plates. We have on our table rice, hominy, fried bacon sometimes, and sometimes stewed beef, cold beef fried over for breakfast. For dinner we have roast beef and potatoes, sometimes pork and cabbage.

Q. What is the difference between theirs and yours, except the kind of dishes?—A. I do not know but they have the same as we have in the morning.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Your food is put on in large dishes, and they have each man his food at his own plate; is that it?—A. Yes, sir; on the plate.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do any of your men that go down to the mess-table ever complain to you that they do not get enough?—A. No, sir; I do not know that any of my men ever complain to me about not getting enough down there.

Q. You do not remember any instance?—A. None, that I remember.

BETSEY LAWSON (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. You are a nurse in a female ward?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. What ward is it?—A. No. 7 and No. 8.

Q. Are you a night-nurse or day-nurse?—A. I am a day-nurse.

Q. Is yours a sick-ward?—A. No, sir; the old people.

Q. What do you do to keep the ward clean?—A. I scrub it.

Q. How often?—A. Twice a week, and sometimes the lower ward where the old afflicted people are every day.

Q. What do you do about the clothing?—A. I change them all once a week, and if any of them is sick they are changed oftener. The beds are changed once a week.

Q. Suppose any of them dirty their beds, what do you do with the beds then?—A. I take the things off and take them to the wash-house and clean them.

Q. Suppose the mattress is defiled?—A. If the mattress is defiled I take it off and have another one filled and put on.

Q. Do you do any different now in that respect from what you used to do?—A. I always have done just as I am doing now.

Q. For how long?—A. I have been here about ten years, I reckon.

Q. You did the same all last summer that you are doing now?—A. I did the same all last summer I am doing now.

Q. What kind of food do you have for your ward?—A. They have very good food.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Plenty to eat?—A. They have plenty to eat, and always have had plenty to eat.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Where do you eat?—A. At the nurses' table.

Q. Is your food well cooked there?—A. Very well cooked.

Q. Is it any different from what it formerly was?—A. No, sir; I do not see any difference in it.

Q. Is there any complaint ever made on the part of your patients that they do not get enough to eat?—A. I never heard any of my patients say they did not get enough to eat.

Q. You never have?—A. No, sir; they always have said they got enough.

BETSEY BORLAND (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. You are a nurse in one of the wards?—Answer. I have been.

Q. Are you a nurse now?—A. Yes, sir; I have all the time been here.

Q. How long?—A. Ever since I could get around.

Q. How many years?—A. I came from the old Freedmen's Village over here; from the time it was broken up.

Q. Have you been here ever since?—A. Yes sir.

Q. In charge of a ward all the time?—A. I have been here sick for all the time; but when I was able to go around, I have always been doing that.

Q. Are you a nurse or an assistant nurse?—A. An assistant nurse.

Q. In what ward do you assist?—A. In Dr. Purvis's ward.

Q. Is that a male ward or a female ward?—A. For old ladies.

Q. Are these what are called sick patients, or are they old people?—A. Old people, pretty much.

Q. What do you do to keep the ward clean?—A. We scrub it.

Q. How often?—A. We wash it sometimes two times a week, and when it is real dirty sometimes oftener. We wash around the stove every day.

Q. What do you do about chauging the beds?—A. We clean the beds.

Q. How often do you put on clean sheets and pillow-cases?—A. Every week.

Q. Do you ever change the mattresses?—A. Yes, sir; we change them, too.

Q. Do you ever see any bugs about the beds?—A. No, sir; I never saw any since I have been here about the beds.

Q. You always keep them clean and nice?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What sort of food do the patients have?—A. They have very nice food.

Q. Do any of them complain that they do not get enough?—A. I hear some of them talk about it; but I get enough to eat.

Q. Do you say that they get enough to eat?—A. They all have enough to eat, I suppose.

Q. Do they ever leave any of it?—A. Yes, sir; they leave things.

Q. You know that?—A. Yes, sir; they cannot eat it all, sometimes.

SUSAN DAWES (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you a patient in the hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Going on seven years.

Q. In whose ward?—A. In Dr. Purvis's

Q. How often is your ward cleaned?—A. It is cleaned every week.

Q. In what manner?—A. Nice and clean; well mopped and well dressed off.

Q. How often are the beds changed?—A. Every week—every Tuesday.

Q. Do you ever get any clean clothes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often?—A. Every week.

Q. What care do the doctors take of the patients in your ward?—A. Very good.

Q. Are they attentive?—A. Very attentive.

Q. What kind of food do you get?—A. I get very nice food, if it was just cooked done—plenty of it.

Q. Is it cooked done?—A. Not as done as it ought to be.

Q. Sometimes it is not thoroughly cooked, you mean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it very well cooked?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you get to eat?—A. We generally have beef, potatoes, cabbage, and such like as that.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Bread?—A. Yes, sir; bread.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is the bread sour or sweet?—A. I do not use wheat-bread—I use corn-bread.

Q. How do you like the corn-bread?—A. Very well; that is my main bread.

Q. And it is good, is it?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you have all you want?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do you ever have to complain that you do not get enough to eat?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has that been so during the last two or three years?—A. So far as I have been in there; I have always had plenty.

Q. Has it always been as good as now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have the wards always been kept as clean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you see any difference between the last three months and the time before that?—A. I do not see any difference; all kept clean, just alike.

HARRIET SMITH (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. How long have you been a patient in this hospital?—Answer. I do not know how many years exactly. I was down at the old hospital several years before they broke up there.

Q. You have been here ever since?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ward are you in?—A. Out in that ward; Dr. Purvis's ward.

Q. What do they do to keep your ward clean?—A. They scour and clean it; keep everything very nice and clean.

Q. How often do they scrub it out?—A. They scrub it out once a week, and mop it around the stoves every morning.

Q. Do they change your clothes?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. How often?—A. Twice a week.

Q. What kind of food do you get?—A. We get pretty good food.

Q. Is there any difference between the food you have got the last three months and what you had before that?—A. Yes, I think there is.

Q. What is the difference?—A. The meat is better.

Q. What was the trouble with the meat before?—A. Some of them said it was spoiled meat, but I did not see it.

Q. Was that the beef?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many times was it spoiled?—A. I heard them say it was once or twice.

Q. With that exception it is the same and it always was?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the cleaning the same as always?—A. Yes, sir; they keep everything very clean.

Q. Did they a year ago and last summer?—A. Yes, sir.

ANNIE COOPER (white) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a patient in the hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. I came in September last.

Q. Under what doctor?—A. Dr. Purvis.

Q. What is done to keep your ward clean?—A. They scrub it once a week, and generally wash around the stoves every morning or two.

Q. Do they change the beds?—A. They change the beds once a week.

Q. Do they give you clean clothes?—A. Yes, sir; I have clean clothes whenever I want them.

Q. What kind of food do you get?—A. I have bread and meat—beef, white bread, corn-bread, sometimes biscuits, sometimes fish.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. I eat in the ward.

Q. Is your food brought to you on a tray?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are very infirm, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

MARY BAGLEY (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. How long have you been in the hospital?—Answer. I have been in it ever since it has been here—ever since they took it from the Freedman's Village. I do not know how many years it has been.

Q. In what ward are you, under what doctor?—A. I am under so many doctors I cannot tell.

Q. Do you know the name of the doctor of your ward?—A. Dr. Reburn, once; then—

Q. Who has particular charge of your ward now; Dr. Purvis or Dr. Glennin?—A. Dr. Purvis.

Q. Do they keep your ward clean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do they do to keep it clean?—A. Scour it, mop it every week.

Q. Do they change the beds?—A. Yes, sir; change them every Monday.

Q. Do they change your clothes?—A. Yes, sir; every Monday, sometimes Saturday night.

Q. How long have they been doing that?—A. They have been doing

that ever since I have been here. We have had our beds changed every week.

Q. They used to have the same care in that way that they now have?
—A. Yes, sir; it has been the same ever since I have been here.

Q. What kind of food do you get?—A. I get very good food, provided it was cooked to suit me. I have no fault to find. I get plenty if it was cooked right.

Q. What is the matter with the cooking?—A. They do not cook it done half the time.

Q. What is it that is not cooked done?—A. Our beef and sometimes our pork.

Q. Is it roasted or boiled?—A. Most of it boiled.

Q. And it is not boiled enough?—A. It is not boiled enough.

Q. Is it any different in that respect now from what it formerly was?—
A. I do not think it is any more done than it always was.

Q. You think the beef never has been boiled enough?—A. No, sir; hardly ever boiled enough. If I die the next minute, I will tell the truth. It is not cooked right.

Q. Are you a cook yourself?—A. No, sir; I have been a cook, though.

Q. How is it about the bread?—A. The bread is tolerably good. I have no fault to find with the bread.

Q. How about the corn-bread?—A. We get good corn-bread. Sometimes we get baker's bread. For my part, I do not eat baker's bread; they give me biscuit.

Q. Are the biscuits good?—A. Yes, sir; and I have a piece of corn-bread. I am fond of corn-bread. They give me a piece of corn-bread every day, any time I like to have it.

Q. Do you ever eat hominy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the hominy good?—A. Sometimes; sometimes it is done, and sometimes it is not.

Q. You think the food is not cooked quite enough?—A. It is not cooked enough.

Q. And never was?—A. I cannot see that there is any difference. I do not wish to tell a lie, noway.

Q. Of course not.—A. I would not speak against them if they do right, and I do not want to speak if they do wrong.

Q. You think the cooking is no better now than it was before?—A. No, sir; it is just the same, I think.

GEORGE CHAPMAN (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What position do you hold in this Freedmen's Hospital?—
Answer. Steward.

Q. What is your duty as steward?—A. My duty is to receive things, and weigh them, and issue them out.

Q. Do you receive all the food?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you weigh it as it is received?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you ascertain the amount?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you keep an account?—A. I return the amount. I do not keep any book of it.

Q. To whom do you return?—A. To Dr. Glennan.

Q. What do you do with it when you receive it?—A. When I first receive it I weigh it. After I weigh it I take the number of pounds or barrels, as it may be, and set it down, and return the written copy of it to the doctor.

Q. Do you issue it to the cooks?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know the quality of the beef that you receive? Do you inspect it?—A. Yes, sir, I do.

Q. State what is received in the way of beef.—A. I receive corned beef and fresh beef. I receive sometimes the round part of the beef and the flank, and sometimes I receive the brisket-pieces, and sometimes I receive pieces of porter-house steak and the second or third joint, the round-pieces.

Q. Are ever any quarters of beef brought?—A. Sometimes.

Q. What is the quality of that meat generally?—A. Very good quality.

Q. Do you ever get any heads?—A. No, sir.

Q. Jaw-bones or pieces of heads?—A. No, sir; never.

Q. Have any such ever been received?—A. No, sir; I never received any.

Q. How long have you been steward?—A. I have been steward of this hospital four years and nine months, I think.

Q. Has it been your duty always to receive the meat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You never have received any such pieces?—A. I never received any heads or jowls since I have been here.

Q. Does it all pass through your hands?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever received any that turned out to be tainted?—A. No, sir. Have I ever received any that turned out to be tainted?

Q. Or tainted when you got it?—A. No, sir; but I have had meat here that has been tainted; small quantities of it.

Q. Tainted after you got it?—A. It got tainted after I received it. That was on account of the hot weather last summer and not having a sufficient quantity of ice. Sometimes we keep it over Saturday night. Small quantities will get tainted, and in that case I did not touch it.

Q. Do you know of complaint being made once or twice of tainted meat?—A. I have heard once, I think, complaint; but at that time I did not know how it was. I could not account for how it was that tainted meat got in the ward; but there was a little here once I know, and I examined it very closely, and I took all the tainted meat out. I think there was about six or eight pounds of it. I never saw any that was tainted when I got it.

Q. Have you always been as careful in receiving meat and other provisions as you are now?—A. Since I have been here, just the same always.

Q. What kind of mackerel do you receive?—A. No. 3.

Q. What is the quality of No. 3 mackerel?—A. They are very good mackerel for the number.

Q. Those are branded by the person who puts them up?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any supervision of that at the market?—A. No, sir.

Q. No. 3, you say, is a good quality of mackerel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there a better quality of mackerel?—A. No. 1 is the best.

Q. And then No. 2?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And No. 3 is a good quality?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The others are extra, are they?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which is the largest size, do you know?—A. No. 1.

Q. They run by sizes, do they?—A. Yes, sir, according to number.

Q. No. 3 is smaller, but is as sweet?—A. Just as sweet.

Q. Is the mackerel you receive sweet?—A. Yes; perfectly sound, good mackerel.

Q. What is the quality of the hominy you have been receiving?—A. The hominy has been very good.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. From whom do you get it?—A. Sometimes from Barbour & Hamilton and sometimes from Whitmeyer.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Are they merchants on the avenue?—A. Barbour & Hamilton are; Whitmeyer is about Twentieth street and the avenue.

Q. Have you ever noticed the manner in which this food is cooked?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is it cooked?—A. It is cooked very good.

Q. Some patients have said that the beef was not cooked enough, and the hominy not cooked enough?—A. Sometimes it has been the case that it was not cooked so good as at other times; but still I always endeavor to have it as good as I can. Sometimes it comes late; but that does not occur once hardly in a year.

Q. Do you overlook the cooking?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Are you a cook yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. As a rule you think the food is well cooked?—A. Yes, sir; it is.

Q. Have you the same cooks now you formerly had?—A. Yes, sir; the cooks here now were here when I first took charge, and I think they had been here for years before I came.

Q. How many cooks have you?—A. Five.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Men or women?—A. Women and men both.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. How much flour is delivered to the hospital in a month?—A. Five barrels.

Q. Where is the rest of it delivered?—A. To Mr. Kaiser, between Sixth and Seventh streets. He is the baker.

Q. Does he bake the bread?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is done with the other five barrels delivered here?—A. Baked up and used for the use of the ward patients.

Q. Is it all used up for that purpose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does it all pass through your hands?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I see on the first page of the last annual report for 1877, the following:

The Colored Orphans' Home and Asylum, containing about one hundred and fifteen, children and attendants, has been furnished with medicines and medical attendance during the year, and subsistence has been furnished to twenty-five of them, who are included in the aggregate number of this hospital.

In what form do you furnish subsistence for the children of the Colored Orphans' Home?—A. We furnished them bread and furnish them part of the meat they used there, and all the sugar and tea up to July last.

Q. Was it stopped last July?—A. About that time, I think.

Q. Had the Colored Orphans' Home been part of this institution since you have been connected with it?—A. I issued rations to it just the same as I did to this institution up to July last.

Q. Had you always done that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under Dr. Reyburn?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That always has been done?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You do not know under what law that was done?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know why it was stopped last July?—A. I do not.

Q. Was that furnished out of the flour that comes to the institution or the bread that is made by this baker?—A. Out of the bread that comes from the baker.

Q. What is the quantity of the bread that goes onto the table in the mess-room of the patients? How much is allowed to each patient?—A. Four ounces.

Q. At each meal?—A. Yes, sir; they get four ounces, and if they want more they can get it.

Q. Do you know of their asking for more?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever know of their being refused more?—A. No, sir.

Q. In no instance?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the quality of your corn-bread?—A. It is a very good quality of corn-bread.

Q. Is the bread well baked?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any article of food that a patient asks for that he does not get—I mean any additional quantity of it?—A. No, sir; I never knew of a case of that kind since I have been here.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Suppose a man wanted more beef or more fish than was given him on his plate, would he get it?—A. In that case, about the meat, if he wanted more and we had it, of course I would give it to him.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. That is if you had it cooked?—A. Yes, sir; if we had it already cooked we would give it to him.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Who has charge of placing the food on the dining-room table or mess-room table?—A. A man by the name of Gray.

Q. From whom does he receive his orders. Do you direct him about that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you any orders or do you give any orders that additional food shall not be placed upon the table if required?—A. No, sir; I never had any such orders and never gave such orders to anybody.

Q. Do you always have an abundance of bread?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You always have a sufficient supply of baked bread?—A. Yes, sir; when we do not have enough baker's bread we bake the flour we get here. If bread is short in the morning we bake it, and if it is short at dinner-time we make corn-bread.

Q. Is the bread delivered every day?—A. Every day.

Q. At what hour of the day, generally?—A. About half-past eight o'clock.

Q. How much bread do you require to be delivered each day—is it dependent upon the number of patients?—A. Sometimes 160 and 165—just now 165 loaves.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Pound-loaves?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Is the bread sweet?—A. Yes, sir; good bread.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. You say now 165 loaves; have you increased the number of loaves lately?—A. Yes, sir; I think I have.

Q. How many?—A. Ten.

Q. Why did you do that?—A. Because a number more patients came in. We increase or decrease it as patients come in or decrease.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Do you eat in the mess-room?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where do you eat?—A. I eat at the steward's table.

Q. Is there any distinction made between the food that the nurses get and the food that the patients get in the mess-room; and, if so, what?—A. No, sir; I do not think there is any material distinction.

Q. Do they get the same breakfast and dinner?—A. The same breakfast.

Q. And the same dinner?—A. The same dinner.

Q. The same articles and the same quality?—A. Yes, sir; but those that have to work get more.

Q. Because they need more?—A. Yes, sir; they need more.

Q. And do they eat more?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To satisfy their hunger?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But the others get all they need, and do not complain?—A. No, sir; once in a while somebody will complain, but what I mean to say about not hearing complaints is that it is not a general thing that I hear any complaint at all made by anybody.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you remember the number of pounds of beef you have brought here each day?—A. Now?

Q. Yes, now; how many pounds were brought here this morning, for instance?—A. Two hundred and sixty pounds.

Q. Is that the usual amount brought each day, or nearly so?—A. No, sir; we do not use the same quantity of beef every day; to-morrow is Sunday.

Q. That is for two days?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you increased the quantity of beef to be delivered in any way within the last two or three months?—A. No, sir; we only increase it as the number of patients increases.

Q. Have you had an increased number of patients lately?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you only increase it in proportion to the number of patients added?—A. Yes, sir; the orders I had are, when the patients increase ten we increase the quantity ten pounds, and if they decrease that many we take off that amount.

Q. Do you estimate the amount of beef each day as a pound a day for a patient?—A. No, sir.

Q. How much for each patient do you estimate?—A. Six ounces.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Did you always have that estimate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There has been no change in quantities and qualities in proportion to patients?—A. No, sir; I have no orders to make any change.

Q. You buy no articles you did not buy three or four or six months ago?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Is there any limitation as to the quantity of coffee?—A. Patients get twelve ounces of coffee, and if they want more they can get it.

Q. That is, you deliver out to the cooks that much each day for a patient?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you weigh it or just estimate it?—A. Weigh it.

Q. You weigh it out in specific form?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you follow up the cooks to see that they do it?—A. Yes, sir; I am right in the kitchen and see that the cooks issue it out to the wards.

Q. You see that it is all properly disposed of and issued to the cooks?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. In what shape does your coffee come ; in sacks?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you burn it yourselves and grind it?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What is the quality of the coffee?—A. Very good Rio coffee.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. No chickory?—A. No, sir.

Q. Nor beans?—A. No, sir; not with the coffee.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you mean to say that you give each patient twelve ounces of coffee a day?—A. No, sir; twelve ounces a week. They have coffee once a day and tea once a day.

JOHN FANTEROY (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you one of the cooks?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been a cook in this institution?—A. Eight years.

Q. What do you cook?—A. We have chickens and beef and mutton.

Q. Are you the head cook?—A. Not exactly head. Mr. Chapman sees to everything; but I have it all go through my hands.

Q. Do you assist in cooking everything, or do you have particular things alone to cook?—A. Everything about the diet that goes to the wards.

Q. You cook for the wards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you cook for the wards or for the mess-room?—A. For the wards.

Q. Do you cook hominy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you cook it thoroughly or not?—A. I cook it thoroughly.

Q. How long do you cook your hominy?—A. Put it on before evening, between three and four o'clock, and let it stay on the fire till next morning.

Q. Does it boil all night?—A. Yes, sir; put it on the range and keep a steady fire.

Q. Does the fire ever go out at night?—A. No, sir; never entirely out.

Q. Some of the women patients, or one of them, said that the hominy was not thoroughly cooked. How is it about that?—A. She was mistaken in that. I do not know exactly how it is, but I know it is cooked thoroughly.

Q. Is it cooked as long as it is usual to cook hominy?—A. Yes, sir. It is always cooked about twelve hours; it is put over the fire at night and let stay until next morning. That was the way in the country always where I came from.

Q. You have done that ever since you have been here?—A. Yes; for the last eight years.

Q. Do you have anything to do with boiling the beef?—A. Yes, sir; one part of it for the ward.

Q. How long do you boil that?—A. We boil beef between three and four hours. We put it on in the morning about eight and a half o'clock and let it stay until about half past eleven, sometimes very near twelve.

Q. With a brisk boiling fire?—A. Gradually boiling. We bake beef and we boil it.

Q. Is that long enough to boil beef?—A. Yes, sir; I think it is, to be thoroughly done.

Q. You think that will thoroughly do it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The complaint of the cooking, so far as we have been able to find out, is that you do not cook things enough. What do you say about that?—A. That would not be said by all. There has been complaint ever since I have been here, first one way and then the other.

Q. You think they are not very contented people?—A. No, we cannot content them.

Q. You think, as a cook, that you cook these things as long as you ought, to have them good?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the cooking the same during the last two or three months as it was the last year, and before that?—A. Yes, sir; pretty much the same. There has not been much change. Of course, in some few things there has been a little change, such as custards and things like that. They have an extra cook for that.

Q. That is for the quite sick patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But the general food of the hospital for the wards is the same?—A. Ever since I have been here it has been pretty much the same thing.

Q. And cooked the same?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you have anything to do with cooking the potatoes for the wards?—A. Yes, sir; I cook potatoes for the wards.

Q. How do you cook them?—A. I pare them, then boil them, and mash them up.

Q. And they are sent in that shape to the wards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you ever send them with the jackets on?—A. Yes, sir; when they are new, in the summer time—when they first come in.

Q. You cook new potatoes with the jacket on?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the size of the potatoes you send to the wards?—A. Medium size.

Q. Do you know how many are allowed to a patient?—A. Two and three; two potatoes, when very large.

Q. Mr. Robert Johnson says that there is only one allowed, and that a very little one. Is that true?—A. He made a mistake about that. They have to bring them back from the wards and throw them away at last into the swill.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What is the character of the beef that you get?—A. Good beef. I do not say it is the best quality, but it is good beef.

Q. What is it? Do you get full quarters of beef?—A. Sometimes we get full quarters, and sometimes a hind quarter. We get what is called the sirloin.

Q. The general quality is good?—A. The general quality is good. I do not call it the best quality of beef.

Q. It is good of the kind?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you in the habit of cooking tainted beef; that is, beef that smells badly; have you ever cooked such beef as that?—A. I tell you

how that was. We had some once or twice. In the summer time, when you get beef Saturday evening and keep it in the ice-house until Monday morning, it is not very good then.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. About how often has that happened?—A. About once or twice or three times, perhaps, from my recollection.

Q. When was that?—A. That was here in the summer in July and August. Now and then a piece will get that way. It stays on the ice.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Have you noticed any change lately in the character of the beef that you get?—A. They get pretty much the same beef. Sometimes, as I say, we get a good piece of hind quarter, the best quality, and then again it will not be so good; but still always good meat.

Q. It averages about the same?—A. Yes; about the same.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. How often do you get the heads of oxen to cook?—A. We never get them. I have never seen one brought here.

Q. Did you ever see any jaws, or under jaws, of oxen?—A. Not of oxen; I have seen some tongues. There is a difference between the tongue and the jaw.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did you ever see or know of the udder of a cow being cooked?—A. Yes; I have seen that here, but they did not send that in the weight, so the butcher says.

Q. What do you do with that?—A. We cook it.

Q. How often?—A. Just when it comes; we objected to it, and they do not send any now.

Q. When did they send it last?—A. About last June, I think; I have not seen any since June or September, I think.

Q. How often?—A. The last piece I know of was here last September; but there has been none since.

Q. Was it frequent before that?—A. No; now and then you would see a piece, just like you would go to market and they would throw in a piece extra for you.

LIZZIE GRAY (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a cook here?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been a cook here?—A. I have been cooking here eight years.

Q. Are you a general cook, or do you have particular things to cook?—A. I am assistant cook. The man who went out of here just now is kind of head; I am assistant, for the employés.

Q. What do you cook?—A. I cook meat, bake meat, bake biscuit, and things like that.

Q. What kind of meat do you cook?—A. Beef, and pork sometimes.

Q. What part of the animal?—A. Sometimes quarters and middlings, and every part like that, shoulders, &c.

Q. Did you ever cook any heads?—A. No, sir, never.

Q. Is the meat good, generally?—A. Very good meat lately.

Q. How was it formerly?—A. Formerly we have had some meat that was a little bad.

Q. What was it, and when?—A. About last fall, I reckon.

Q. What did you have then?—A. We had meat that was a little kind of tainted—when it was very warm, though. We generally have ice to keep it on.

Q. How often did you have tainted meat?—A. Twice.

Q. Was all the meat that you got tainted?—A. It was not so that they could not eat it.

Q. How much of it was tainted?—A. It was when it was so warm. After that we got more ice, and then could keep it good. When the weather is so very hot people would almost die, we could not keep anything.

Q. Did you eat part of the meat?—A. I cooked some of it.

Q. Did you eat it?—A. Yes, sir; I did eat it.

Q. It was not so that you could not eat it?—A. It was not so nobody could not eat it if they wanted to.

Q. That happened twice?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you cook corn-bread?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you cook it?—A. I put grease in it and stir it up.

Q. What else do you put in?—A. I do not put anything else but grease.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Do you not put any eggs in it?—A. Sometimes when I make bread for the little table I put eggs in it. We cannot afford to put eggs in all, as many people as we have.

Q. Have you plenty of eggs always?—A. We have plenty of eggs. Sick people have them generally. Some have them boiled, some have them fried.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you cook the hominy?—A. No, sir; the man cooks the hominy.

Q. Do you have anything to do with the sauce that is put over the hominy?—A. I put it on.

Q. What is the sauce?—A. We take butter and lard and make a little sauce to put over it. It is good enough for anybody to eat if they want to.

Q. You put in butter and what else?—A. A little lard, and mix it right fine. It is good enough for anybody to eat.

Q. Good, sweet sauce, is it?—A. Yes, sir; very nice.

Q. Do you think it right to call the sauce you put on the hominy "dirty old slops"?—A. No, sir; I do not call it dirty old slops.

Q. You think that it is good?—A. Yes, sir; real good.

Q. You use it?—A. Yes, sir. Anything I eat I think anybody else can eat.

Q. Do you eat any of it yourself?—A. Yes, sir; always. I taste it to see whether it is good or not.

Q. Is the bread that is baked and brought here sweet bread?—A. We have very nice bread here lately.

Q. How was it formerly?—A. We were complaining last fall very much about the bread being sour.

Q. Was it sour?—A. A little sour, but never so that we could not eat it.

Q. Was it sour all the time?—A. No, sir. As soon as we found it out we just stopped, and they brought us nice, fresh bread.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How was it last spring?—A. It was just as I tell you. Only lately, last fall, they were complaining about it, and I said to myself it was not so that I could not eat it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You do not have anything to do with baking that?—A. No, sir; that is all done outside.

ANNA M. POWELL (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you a cook at the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been?—A. I have been here since last June.

Q. Are you a cook or assistant cook?—A. I have charge of the extra diet.

Q. What is that extra diet?—A. It consists of delicacies for the sick—custards, beef-tea, and so on.

Q. Were you put in charge of it last June when you came?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has it been just the same ever since last June?—A. Ever since. I was sick a few weeks and another woman was there then.

Q. But when you came last June, you were put to cooking this extra diet?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was long before any investigation?—A. Yes, sir; before the investigation started.

Q. You are doing now just what you did then?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And just in the same way?—A. Just the same.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Has there been no change at all?—A. No change.

GEORGE GRAY (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your duty at the hospital?—Answer. Attending to the dining-room.

Q. What is the quality of the food in the dining-room given to the patients?—A. It is good quality.

Q. Do the patients have all they want to eat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever known of any complaint on their part?—A. I have; but then recollect the place I am in. If I say I hear complaints, I must keep these things, because I have to attend to them. One likes one thing and another does not like it, but generally they have enough; but some do not like one thing and some do not like another.

Q. Suppose a patient wants more bread, does he get it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever refused a patient bread when he wanted it?—A. No, sir.

Q. How much bread do they have?—A. A pound pone of light bread, cut into four slices.

Q. Suppose a man eats up his bread and asks for more, do you give it to him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any difference in the quality of food, or the cooking of it, between what is furnished to the patients in the mess-room, and to the nurses who eat there?—A. Yes, sir; it is cooked in a little different shape.

Q. What is the difference between them?—A. In the dining-room it is boiled straight without being baked. We have boiled; on the other side, they have baked things—baked beef and potatoes.

Q. What is the quality of the meat?—A. The meat is generally good at this time.

Q. When was it not good?—A. It has been some time ago that it was poor, and, as they say, salty. That was one of the complaints.

Q. Do you mean salty corned beef?—A. It was not the corned beef, but the bacon.

Q. They complained that the bacon was salty?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Too much salt?—A. They complained there was too much salt.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did you taste the bacon?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was it to your taste?—A. It was salty.

Q. Was that uniformly so, or only on that occasion?—A. It was only at times it was that way.

Q. Do they have the same bread at both tables?—A. They have the same bread.

Q. The same corn-bread?—A. That is in the full diet. In the ward diet, they have light bread generally all the time, except those who want corn-bread; and in the dining-room they have light bread one time and at other times corn-bread.

Q. Do they get the same bread at the nurses' table that they do at the patients' mess-table?—A. Yes, sir; the same bread.

Q. The same corn-bread?—A. The same corn-bread.

Q. The same hominy?—A. The same hominy.

Q. The same meats, except that you say the beef is boiled in one case and baked in the other?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same mackerel?—A. The same mackerel.

Q. What is the breakfast at the patients' mess-room?—A. Monday morning it is hominy and bacon and light bread and coffee.

Q. What is it other mornings?—A. Tuesday morning it is generally rice, butter, and coffee, and light bread.

Q. Wednesday morning?—A. Wednesday they have hash, and butter, and coffee, and light bread.

Q. Thursday?—A. Thursday morning they have rice, molasses, butter, and light bread.

Q. Friday?—A. Friday they have rice, molasses, butter, and light bread.

Q. Saturday?—A. Saturday we generally have for breakfast hominy, bacon, and bread and butter.

Q. And coffee every morning?—A. Every morning coffee.

Q. Now, Sunday morning?—A. Sunday morning they generally have hash, butter, light bread, and coffee.

Q. How long has that been the course of food?—A. Since they have been having meat for breakfast; since the first of the fall.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What sort of meat?—A. Bacon.

Q. You did not have bacon formerly?—A. Not before that.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. That is the only distinction?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Four years ago when Dr. Reyburn was here, how was it then?—

A. For breakfast then we only had hominy, bread, and coffee.

Q. It has been better since then?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. The hash you have twice a week, has that always been so?—A. There has always been hash.

Q. Do you have any cooked meats for breakfast except bacon?—A. No, sir; not in the dining-room.

Q. And never have had?—A. No, sir.

Dr. G. S. PALMER, recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. I want you to explain with reference to an article published in the Evening Star of last evening, under the head of "Freedmen's Hospital," where it speaks about the flour used at the hospital, and I will read a part of this article. After saying that there is "a flour mystery," it says:

It seems that in January, 1877, 45 barrels of flour were provided for 279 patients; in March, 45 barrels for 293 patients; in April, 52 barrels for 235 patients, while in August, with 255 patients, only 19 barrels were purchased, and in September, with 246 patients, the amount was 28 barrels.

Referring to three doctors belonging to the Interior Department who were required by Secretary Schurz to make an investigation into the hospital:

The doctors are prompt with their explanations. One suggests that when flour was low Dr. Palmer made contracts and purchased in excess of use; but, when questioned, he is constrained to admit that he has no knowledge of any accumulation of flour at the hospital, and had not examined to find whether flour had depreciated in the months in which an excess was supposed to have been bought. Secretary Schurz soon gives this explanation its quietus, by showing that from July, 1874, to July, 1877, the number of patients was about the same, between 296 and 270, and the number of barrels furnished was between 44 and 52; and that no accumulation appeared in the whole period. Another doctor steps into the imminent deadly breach and suggests that the colored orphan asylum was furnished with bread until the first of July, and that when this supply was discontinued less flour was needed. It is now developed by close questioning that no authority was discovered for furnishing bread to the asylum. When the doctors are shown that in July 41 barrels of flour were provided, showing only an inconsiderable decrease from the preceding month, they discover that the asylum was not dropped until the 1st of August; but to explain how it was that 28 barrels were required for 246 persons in September, and only 19 barrels for 255 persons in August, even the orphan asylum is of no avail. One of the doctors now figures that the asylum would require a barrel of flour a day, or 30 barrels a month. When it is pointed out to him that this estimate would allow considerably more to each orphan than to each grown inmate of the hospital, he remarks sententiously: "Children growing require as much food as laboring men." All the explanations being unsatisfactory, it still remains a mystery how 44 barrels of flour should be required in one month and only 19 in another for the same number of patients.

Make a statement of the truth in regard to the purchase of flour, and its use, in connection with the statement herein made?—Answer. The flour has been purchased each month as it has been needed. The flour has never been brought to the hospital, except a barrel or two, and sometimes three, for special use in the hospital in baking. The flour has been carried directly from Mr. Galt's, the party of whom I purchase the flour, to the baker, and occasionally the flour runs low toward the end of the month, and it requires an additional supply at the end of the month, and that is charged in the month in which it is ordered. On the subsequent month there is always a less quantity than in the month in which the larger amount was ordered. For instance—

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Take these identical months and explain them?—A. Yes, sir; in July, 1877, on the 27th day of July, I thought flour was going to rise

and I ordered twelve barrels of flour on that day. The supply for the month was already in. That, added to the flour that had already been purchased and sent to the baker, made forty barrels. One barrel was sent to the hospital. In the next month those twelve barrels were used, and that, added to the sixteen, make twenty-eight barrels used by the baker that month, and that taken from the forty leaves twenty-eight barrels for July, making the two months exactly equal. Any one hundred days taken together, the average will be the same. If the books are examined and the accounts of the party of whom we purchase the flour and our own books and vouchers, they will come very nearly the same amount in every one hundred days. By taking two consecutive months you cannot tell how much is used in each month by the accounts; but the whole amount that is used in three months will show the average.

Q. Take three or five months and you will get it?—A. You will get an average of the quantity used in the hospital for the time.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. So you say that from January, 1877, down to the present time, if you will take the amount used for each three months of that time, there will be the same average during the year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By taking two months together it might be shown that there was a greater or less amount; but taking three months together, it will be shown that the average is the same?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever had any flour delivered that was not used for the purposes of the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. In your annual report you say something about furnishing rations, &c., to the Children's Colored Home; was that ever part of this hospital?—A. When this hospital was established, this hospital had of its inmates, of those who were carried on its rolls, eighty children that were kept up there, and rations were supplied them. They were part of the hospital. The ladies who had control of that could manage the children better there than they could be managed here, and the older patients were kept here and the children put there. They have been carried along, but have gradually diminished until, in 1876, they got down to twenty-eight, and then to 25, and finally, this year, I discharged them altogether.

Q. So that it was in carrying out the business of the hospital as you found it when you came here that you furnished these rations?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But on account of the age that the children had attained in July you discharged them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were the rations, &c., that you furnished delivered into the hands of the ladies who have charge of that institution?—A. Yes, sir; and the matron of the institution.

Q. You have no interest in it?—A. None.

Q. Do you have the handling of any money whatever belonging to this institution?—A. None at all.

Q. The vouchers are passed upon in the Interior Department?—A. I have handled only \$29.70 of the hospital money and \$10 more. Thirty-nine dollars and seventy cents is all the money that has ever passed through my hands since I have been in charge of the hospital.

Q. How did you get that money?—A. I got that money from the sale of two worn-out horses, and I have the Treasury receipt for that. It was turned into the Treasury, and I have the receipt for it. Ten dollars was taken for a patient who, after he came here, was found to be

able to pay his bills, and that I have on hand now. It has never been turned in. That will be turned in at the end of this month.

Q. When did you receive that?—A. I received that in January, I think. I am waiting to turn that in.

Q. But the expenditures for the institution do not pass through your hands at all?—A. Not at all.

Q. If there is any swindling in the purchase of flour or in delivering more than is necessary for the institution, that swindling must be with the connivance of Galt & Co., with whom you trade?—A. There must be that connivance. Then, here is a little book which Dr. Glennau has kept in which he has kept all the barrels of flour received, the number of pounds of flour, and then the number of pounds of bread which have been received daily; it has been kept here in the hospital for years, ever since the hospital was established.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. I see that your report shows the number of pounds of bread that a barrel of flour will return?—A. Yes, sir; and we keep it in this book. This book corresponds, no doubt, with the vouchers and with the books of Galt & Co., who charge the flour to the concern.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. We want a statement from those vouchers and an opportunity to examine fully the original vouchers, but I wish to ask another question now. It is stated in this paper that the doctors who made the investigation, at the request of Secretary Schurz, "find a difficulty in making it perfectly evident why they took no notice of the fact that an assistant engineer, discharged in May, 1875, was borne on the rolls at the rate of \$75 a month until October, 1875." What is the fact in reference to that?—A. When I came here there was an engineer and an assistant engineer. The assistant engineer was receiving \$25 a month; he and the engineer did not agree very well. I kept him along to take charge of the engine at such times as the engineer was off, and finally he was discharged in October, when his last voucher was paid, and he received every dollar of the money for which vouchers were drawn. Nobody else could draw his money but him.

Q. He was not discharged in May, but was discharged in October?—A. He was discharged in October.

Q. Did he work up to October?—A. He worked up to October.

Q. It says here at the rate of \$75 a month?—A. It was \$25 a month.

Q. Something is said here about the purchase of eggs for the hospital. It is said, "It appears that from 110 to 190 dozen eggs a month were purchased, an average of more than half a dozen a month to each inmate."—A. In regard to the eggs, I will say we use a large quantity of eggs as a proper article of diet for the sick, and find them an economical article of diet too. We issue for the ward diet 276 eggs, 24 dozen per week; for custards and corn-s'arch we use 84 eggs a week; for the nurses' table 48, that is four dozen, on Sunday morning, and for the steward's table one dozen on Sunday morning; and for the dispensary, to make cod-liver emulsion and milk-punch, 28 eggs a week, making 508 eggs a week, that, multiplied by four, gives 2,032 eggs in the four weeks; divided by 12, it gives 170 dozen of eggs in four weeks. That is about the average.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. For a month would be a little more?—A. Yes, sir; some months it runs up from that and some months it runs down; that is about the average of the eggs we use here in the hospital.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Could you get along with less eggs than you use here?—A. We could, but I fear they would call it starvation diet.

Q. Did you have anything to do with the appointment of those doctors who were selected by the Interior Department to make the examination of this hospital?—A. I did not.

Q. Did you know them before?—A. I knew only one of them. I have met Dr. Walsh once. I had some acquaintance with Dr. Hood, but with Dr. Ewing I had no acquaintance; I only knew him when I met him. I was informed that they were good men. When I found that the investigation was going to take place, I asked the chief clerk if they had appointed a good committee. He said they had a good, honest committee. I said, "Then I am satisfied." That was all I knew of it.

Q. The jury was not passed upon by you or selected by you in any way?—A. Not at all.

THURSDAY, *February 28, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

JAMES P. HERRON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside in Washington City, on Eighth street northwest, No. 922, between I and K streets.

Q. Did you have anything to do with softening some palm pulp, in order to make paper, at the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; stems and leaves.

Q. With whom did you make an arrangement for that purpose? Relate all the circumstances.—A. It was about two years ago, along in March, I suppose. Before that time we had been making some tests here at Pettit & Dripps's. We failed there in power, and in looking round the city for some place to get some steam where we could do some steaming, and also for an engineer to take something of charge of that department, I, in calling out at the Howard University, fell into the room where they had their engine, and looking there with Mr. Calvert, we found that there were some old tubs, or washers you might call them, that had pipes and steam connected with them, that could be used for that purpose. There was one they were not using; it was old and leaked somewhat; the inside was a revolving machine that could be lifted out. We decided that that could be used for our purpose, just lifting that out. Mr. Calvert told me they never used that washer.

Q. What was the steam that was used there?—A. Steam was used from their boiler that they used there for washing purposes and other purposes; I do not know what.

Q. Was extra steam made for you?—A. I do not think there was any extra steam made. We had that understanding in the first place, that it would not require any extra steam.

Q. Who told you it would not require extra steam?—A. Mr. Calvert said it would not be any loss. When we concluded that it could be done there, I went to Dr. Palmer, he being in charge there, and told him that there was a chance there of having something of that kind done, and the doctor told me that anything that could be done, so that it would not require any expense to the government or take any of the labor of the employés around the hospital—if it would not inter-

fere in that way, he would be willing should be done. I told Mr. Calvert what Dr. Palmer had said, and he decided that it would not take any at all; that the steam which would be used for that purpose would be just a little from the cooking; that there was that much steam blown off every day, or not consumed every day, and it would really be no expense to the government. He assured me of that.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Simply the exhaust steam?—A. Simply that. He said that we could use a little of that and it would be no expense, and if it was we could not use it. That was the assurance that I had.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did Mr. Calvert have any interest in the matter or any offer from the company?—A. He did not have any interest in the matter at that time more than this: I had been looking for an engineer to go to the South and run the machinery we proposed taking there for fibering palm into pulp, and he recommended himself as being a fine engineer, and one who would be the very person to take charge of that work. In that way I had talk with him about giving him a certain interest. I proposed that any engineer who would go into our service in that way we would give him an interest. Mr. Calvert proposed that he would take an interest with us. At that time he had not any, but I made out a paper or two to him afterward for a number of shares of stock, which he never came up to.

Q. Did he ever accept?—A. He never accepted.

Q. Did Dr. Palmer have any interest in it?—A. Dr. Palmer was a member of the company. He was treasurer of the company.

Q. Was the experiment a success?—A. It was a success as far as we were working at that time. It was to know about what amount of per cent. there would be of paper-stalk in the palm, and to pound the stems down to throw them into a condition of the leaves to be used. In that it was very successful.

Q. Is the manufacturing carried on now or has it been abandoned?—A. We just got back last week from the East; we are still maturing it further, and find the experiment to promise very finely. The Crane Brothers have some paper made at the works. It makes bank note paper; can make the finest bank-note paper known to our country.

Q. I understand you made the arrangement with Calvert to use this steam and old tub on his stating it would be no expense to the government?—A. Yes, sir; he assured me it would be no expense to the government, because there was that much waste steam every day. We put the matter into a vessel to cook it that did not take a great deal of steam.

Dr. G. S. PALMER recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Something was said by Mr. Calvert with reference to using the machinery and steam of the Howard University or the Freedmen's Hospital, in a paper operation. What do you know about that?—A. I know that in the spring of 1876, about April I think, Mr. Herron came to me and asked permission to bring some palm there to soften with the waste steam, which was being thrown off every day from the engine. I told him I could not do it if it would be any expense to the government or any damage to anybody else. He said he had had a talk with the engineer about it, and the engineer had assured him that

it would be no expense and no cost to anybody. I then told him that I would see the engineer; I did see the engineer and he told me the same. He said there would not be any cost to anybody. I told Mr. Herron that I would not have it there at all if it would be one cent of expense to the government; I also stated the same distinctly to Mr. Calvert, the engineer, that it should not come there under any circumstances if it was to be any detriment to his operations, or any expense to the government. He assured me that it would not be.

By MR. EATON :

Q. By that you mean, if it would require any additional coal?—A. Any additional coal or any labor or interference in any way. After that assurance I said that I would not interfere if he wanted to make the arrangement, which I understood he did, because he was going to be the engineer for these parties, and talked about taking stock in the company. I told him I was a member of that company, and the company was a losing concern, and he had better not have anything to do with it. He testified to that on cross-examination before the other committee, that I advised him not to have anything to do with taking the stock. I was a member of the company, and the company had lost money in making machinery, and I had lost confidence in the concern. First, Mr. Herron talked of 250 pounds, but I believe he brought another batch, so that it amounted altogether to about 500 pounds. I do not believe to-day that there was one cent of expense to the government; I did not think so then, and do not think so now. I think the same amount of steam which was used in that operation has been lost every day since and was every day before, while the engine has been used for its present purposes. I can show the committee when they come out there exactly the operation that was done. The steam-tub is there. It is an old tub which has never been used, and the pipe that let the steam in is there, and the entire thing, so that they can see for themselves and judge for themselves as to whether there was any expense to the government or not.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Something was said about a piece of pipe, about two feet long I think, that was used on your premises. Do you know to whom that pipe belonged?—A. The circumstances about that pipe are these: I went out to the shed near the engine-room one day and saw a piece of second-hand pipe lying there that I thought would be just what I wanted to fix a fountain with. I asked Mr. Calvert, the engineer, to whom that belonged? He said it belonged to the University. I said to him, "It is just what I want, and I will see Johnson," who is the treasurer of the University and has control of the property, "and I will have that piece of pipe. It is no use to anybody here only for old iron, and I will pay him for it and it will answer my purpose instead of buying new." A few days after that I met Mr. Johnson and asked him if I could have it, and he said yes, and I think something was said about the cost of it. It might weigh thirty or forty pounds, and it would be worth about twenty-five or thirty cents at the rate old iron was going at. He told me I could have it, and I think he said I could have more if I wanted it, at the same rate. Mr. Johnson will be here and he can tell you for himself what occurred.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. It did not belong to the United States any way?—A. No, sir; it belonged to the Howard University.

Dr. C. B. PURVIS recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What do you know about this pulp and the use of steam in the hospital for it?—Answer. During the month of April, 1876, I think, I had a conversation with Mr. Calvert about it. I was walking down near the engine-house and he came toward me, and I saw a man beating or pounding some of this matter in an iron pot. I asked him, "What are you doing down there?" Said he, "We are trying to make pulp out of some palm." Then I virtually asked him if he was doing it at government expense. He said, "It is not costing the government anything; we are just using an old tub with some waste steam in the engine-room." I think he said, "We first press it through an old washer or wringer." Then I was about moving off, and he said to me, "Wait a minute; I want to ask your advice about this. I have been thinking about taking some stock in it. They want me to go down to Florida and become an engineer for them. What do you think about it?" Said I, "What are they going to pay you?" Said he, "They have not said anything about that, but they rather offered to pay me stock." I said to him, "I do not believe you can make paper any cheaper than it is being made now; I would not have anything to do with it." That was all the conversation I had with him about it.

Q. Was there any mistake in a part of your former testimony?—A. In my former testimony I testified that the Howard University did not pay us any salary, nor did I receive any of the matriculation fees; nor did Dr. Palmer; that we gave them to the other professors. I could have added, in addition to the matriculation fee, the graduation fee, but it did not occur to me at the time; after looking over the testimony it did. When the University became embarrassed, I went to Philadelphia, and I saw two or three of my personal friends and they gave me a small sum of money as a nucleus for an endowment. It did not occur to me at the time I was examined before. It does not amount to much, but last year I got the benefit of that and they paid me \$110. The fund just now is not in a very tangible shape. That was all I wanted to correct. I did not want to keep anything back.

Q. That comes from private endowment?—A. Yes, sir; a small sum of money; I forgot to mention it the other day, and I wanted to mention it.

Q. Is that what you wanted to explain?—A. Yes, sir. Then there is one other thing; I was asked whether I handled any funds. I said, "Not a farthing." I see in the testimony is added "except a small sum." I do not know what was meant by that unless my salary. I do not handle any money at all other than my salary.

PATRICK H. SHEEHY sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. 2023 Seventh street northwest.

Q. What is your business?—A. Grocery and liquor business.

Q. Do you know Mr. Calvert, the engineer at the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; have known him about eight or nine years.

Q. Have you at any time had a conversation with him with reference to what would happen, as far as he was concerned, if Dr. Palmer was removed?—A. Yes, sir; on one occasion, before this former investigation took place, he met me in front of my place of business and asked me if I heard about the investigation that was going to take place. I told him

no. He said, "You get this morning's Republican and you will see all the charges." He said, "I am going to give my seven years' experience in the hospital." He thought Dr. Palmer treated him bad by cutting his pay down, I think he said from \$80 to \$50, and if they were successful, as he thought they would be, he was offered a big inducement; he was guaranteed \$100, and probably \$150 a month. I did not pay particular attention any more to what the man said, because I was a disinterested party. But it seems somebody found out that he had the conversation with me, and I was summoned in the former investigation.

Q. Did you make this statement in that investigation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he state who had made this guarantee to him?—A. No, sir; I did not ask him any questions at all about it. He voluntarily told me this himself.

WILLIAM H. HOOVER sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Butcher.

Q. In what markets do you have stalls?—A. In the Center Market.

Q. Where is the Center Market?—A. The Washington Market, Seventh street and Pennsylvania avenue.

Q. Your stall is numbered 52, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where do you live?—A. I live on the Bladensburg road, in the county of Washington.

Q. Do you do a considerable business as a butcher?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you furnish the meat for the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you furnished it?—A. I think about five or six years.

Q. What kind of meats do you furnish?—A. I furnish good quality of meats.

Q. What articles?—A. I furnish fresh beef, salt beef, mutton, salt pork, bacon, and hams.

Q. What parts of the animal do you furnish for fresh beef?—A. I have furnished sometimes quarters of beef, and, when convenient and the interests of the hospital required, I cut up good-sized pieces, 8, 10, 12 pound pieces of the front and hind quarters.

Q. Is this the kind of meat you sell to your ordinary customers?—A. Yes, sir; from my stall in the market.

Q. Do you always furnish good beef?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it ever tainted when it leaves your place?—A. I have never sent a pound of tainted meat to that institution in my life.

Q. Did you buy a cow of Calvert?—A. I did.

Q. Was that cow diseased?—A. No, sir. I never killed a diseased cow in my life but one, and then I had the board of health to condemn it.

Q. Did you sell any of the meat of that cow that you bought of Calvert to the hospital?—A. No, sir. I was not furnishing meat to the hospital at that time. I have furnished meat to the hospital five or six years, with the exception of five months in 1876.

Q. And during those five months in 1876 you bought that cow Calvert says he sold you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you say that was not a diseased cow?—A. It was not.

Q. Do you ever furnish heads or the lower part of the shank on the hoof?—A. No, sir.

Q. Never have sent anything of the kind?—A. Never sent anything of the kind.

Q. Have you ever sent hearts?—A. I have sent hearts.

Q. How often?—A. Very rarely; not once in three months. I do not suppose in the six years twenty-five hearts ever went out there, because in the winter time the pork-butchers buy all the beef-hearts, and in the summer time we sell them for the chucks, and they bring us 5 cents a pound to the pork-butchers. It is no interest in the world for me ever to send them there. I do not think I ever sent a heart there unless requested by some one. They send to me for liver occasionally, and I supply them with liver occasionally. I do not know how I ever came to send a heart. It is no advantage in the world to me to send it.

Q. Whenever one was sent, you think it was on account of the request of some one that one might be sent out?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The heart is sometimes cooked at hotels and elsewhere for food, is it not?—A. Yes, sir. There is complaint about tongues, I have heard. I have sent tongues there. I thought I was doing them a favor in doing it.

Q. Do you send udders there?—A. No, sir.

Q. And never have?—A. I never sent an udder of a cow there in my life, unless it went on the hind quarter of a heifer, or perhaps I sent a hind quarter of a cow, the same as I serve any store a hind quarter of beef and send it as it is.

Q. Did you ever send the jowl, the under jaw of beef?—A. No, sir.

Q. You send up wholesome, merchantable beef?—A. I do.

Q. What kind of salt pork do you send?—A. I send as good pork as any gentleman in this room eats.

Q. And mutton?—A. The mutton I send by the side.

Q. Is the salt pork you send of your own curing, or what you buy?—A. No sir; I am in the beef-butcher business.

Q. You buy the salt pork?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What care do you take to see that it is good?—A. I pay a No. 1 price for it, and I notice and see it. I am a judge of it; I can tell it is good. The gentleman I purchase it from is present here.

Q. The ham and other articles you furnish, you say are good?—A. Yes, sir; there is no gentleman in this room who eats any better ham or pork than goes to that hospital.

Q. What price did you get for the beef you sent during the last two years?—A. Eight cents a pound for the beef; nine for the pork; thirteen for hams, and the same price for mutton as for beef.

Q. Are these reasonable prices for the quantities you furnish?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As low as they could be furnished?—A. As low as they could be furnished.

Q. Is there any understanding or agreement between yourself and any other person whatever by which that person is to receive any percentage of the money which you get?—A. Not in the least.

Q. And never has been?—A. Never has been.

Q. So far as you know, the trade on behalf of the government with you is honest and square?—A. Yes, sir; entirely so.

Q. Do you salt down beef?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And furnish some of that to the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your mode of doing that?—A. The mode of doing that is this: If I killed a bullock yesterday I take him to market this morning. His flanks and briskets I soak in clear water for about an hour to get

the blood out. I then put them in brine. The next day that meat is ready to be sold.

Q. So that it is always fresh salt beef, to use a strange expression?—
A. Yes, sir; and you cannot get anything else in this District in the summer time but fresh corned beef.

Q. Something has been said about there having been two occasions last summer when the beef that was served up at the hospital, or some part of the beef served up, was tainted. Was it tainted at the time it left your stall?—A. It was not.

Q. How soon after killing do you furnish beef to the hospital?—A. In the summer time I kill it in the afternoon, and by half past eight at the farthest the next morning it is delivered at the hospital. Dr. Palmer's orders are to have it there at eight or half past eight.

Q. Do you keep it away from the flies?—A. I have a number one ice-house twenty-four feet under ground, and keep it in the ice-house.

WILLIAM WOLF sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In the city of Washington, 719 Sixth street northwest.

Q. What is your business?—A. Food-inspector under the Board of Health.

Q. How long have you held that office?—A. Between five and six years.

Q. Has it been your duty to inspect the meat delivered by Mr. Hoover to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. No, sir; it is my duty to inspect all meats in markets and in commission houses or wherever I find any meat, and so of vegetables or other food. I inspect it, and condemn such as is considered not fit for food.

Q. Have you in the discharge of that duty inspected the meat of Mr. Hoover?—A. I inspect the meat of Mr. Hoover every day, the same as I do all the rest of the butchers in market.

Q. Do you make a careful inspection of it?—A. I do.

Q. Are you an expert in that business?—A. I am.

Q. Are you a butcher by trade?—A. I am.

Q. What kind of meat does Mr. Hoover keep on hand?—A. Mr. Hoover keeps very good meat on hand. I always find his meat as good as that of all the rest of the butchers, in very good condition, fresh, and he keeps his corned beef always nice. I examine closely, especially in the summer-time, and I find it always in very good order.

Q. Do you inspect anything except fresh meats?—A. Yes, sir; I inspect all vegetables, food, chickens, poultry, and everything almost.

Q. Is it your duty to inspect salt meats?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you inspect mackerel?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Only meats and vegetables?—A. Only these.

Q. Has it been your duty to inspect the salt meat that he has delivered at the hospital? Have you had any opportunity to know about the quality of that?—A. I have examined Mr. Hoover's corned beef, as well as that of the rest of them in the market, every morning, especially in summer-time, and found it always in good order.

Q. Is Mr. Hoover a reputable tradesman?—A. Yes, sir; he does a large business in the market.

Q. And is he respected as such?—A. He is respected in that line.

RICHARD HARTNETT sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your occupation ?—Answer. Butcher.

Q. Have you ever been in the employ of Mr. Hoover ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At what time ?—A. Last summer.

Q. For how long ?—A. I worked last summer with him up to the commencement of winter, about February, I think.

Q. Are you now in his employ ?—A. No, sir.

Q. And have not been since the commencement of winter ?—A. No, sir ; but I kill for him sometimes ; not regularly.

Q. Do you kill for others ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you sometimes now kill for him ?—A. I do.

Q. Did you see the kind of meat that he sent last summer to the Freedmen's Hospital ?—A. Yes, sir ; I carried it there myself.

Q. Just describe it.—A. It was fresh beef, corned beef, mutton, shoulders, hams, and so forth.

Q. What was the quality ?—A. Good quality.

Q. Was it fresh, untainted meat ?—A. It was not tainted. I never carried any tainted meat there.

Q. Did you ever carry any heads ?—A. I never carried anything like that.

Q. Or anything in the nature of offal of an animal ?—A. Nothing in that line at all.

Q. Or uneatable stuff ?—A. No, sir.

Q. You carried also salted beef, did you ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that good beef ?—A. Good, sound, salted beef.

Q. Do you know anything about the process of curing it that was used ?—A. Yes, sir. The beef was taken and soaked to-day and put in brine, and to-morrow it would be corned beef fresh.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. One day only ?—A. Sometimes one day and sometimes longer.

Q. How much longer ?—A. A week sometimes ; sometimes more than a week ; sometimes if we have not got enough of it we buy some.

Q. Did any meat lie in the summer over a week in the brine ?—A. No, sir ; I do not think it would keep a week in summer-time, unless you kept it in the ice-house, and then it would be very doubtful. Corned beef is a very hard matter to keep in summer-time.

Q. You noticed that all the beef you took there was good quality, whether fresh beef or salted beef ?—A. Yes, sir ; both kinds were good quality of beef.

Q. Did you notice the salt pork ?—A. I never noticed the pork ; I used to carry it there.

Q. Do you know how that was taken, in barrels or in pieces ?—A. I used to take it out there in pieces.

Q. You say you did not notice about it ?—A. I never noticed. He used to see about that himself.

Q. Is Mr. Hoover a large dealer ?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. While you were carrying meat to the hospital, did you have any arrangement or understanding with anybody by which you were to receive any percentage or advantage from it ?—A. No, sir ; I never had.

Q. You know of none at all ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever hear Mr. Hoover speak of anything of the kind ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or Dr. Palmer, or Dr. Purvis, or any other man?—A. No man connected with that place.

Q. Or any other place?—A. No, sir.

Q. To what stall in the market are you now attached?—A. Eighty-two, I think.

Q. Who is the proprietor of that?—A. Charles A. Hoover.

Q. A brother of this Mr. Hoover?—A. Yes, sir.

SANTUS AUTH sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Butcher.

Q. Where do you live?—A. On the Bladensburg turnpike.

Q. Are you connected with any stall in the market?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What one?—A. No. 33.

Q. Are you carrying on business on your own account?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know about the quality of meat sold by William H. Hoover?
—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the character of it?—A. All sound, good meat, as far as I know and as far as I have seen.

Q. Have you had occasion to examine it or notice it sometimes?—A. Yes, sir; he is right in the next stall to me.

Q. What is the reputation of Mr. Hoover as a dealer, an honest man?—A. As far as I know he is an honest man and keeps good meat.

Q. Do you know anything about the meats of last summer furnished by Mr. Hoover, particularly?—A. Yes, sir; he stood right alongside of me. It was all good and sound, every thing I saw, and all good meat, the best quality that could be got at the time.

Q. Do you know the occasions when the meat went from his stall to the hospital?—A. I have always seen it go from there early in the morning, and it is always good and sound; it always left the market good and sound.

Q. You knew the meats that were going to the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What were they?—A. All the same as they sell in the market, good meat, quarters, and sometimes cut up into smaller pieces.

Q. Did it seem to be of the same character furnished to other customers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you bought hearts of Mr. Hoover?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you buy the hearts now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you take all he has?—A. All he has.

Q. Did you ever see any hearts sent out to the hospital?—A. Not lately.

Q. When did you see any?—A. That has been some time since; a year or better. Once in a while I saw one, but not very often.

Q. Are the hams and other salt meat that go to the hospital bought of you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What quality of salt meat do you furnish?—A. The best that can be got in the market.

Q. Do you salt it yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you now refer to salt pork?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your process?—A. I have an ice-house, and we cure it there in the summer-time. In the winter-time we do not need to put it in the ice-house. It is always cured well and sound.

Q. Just as good salt pork as you furnish to families?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same article?—A. The same kind.

Q. Out of the same pile?—A. Out of the same pile.

Q. Where do you get the hams that you salt?—A. I am killing the hogs, and curing them and smoking them myself.

Q. In furnishing hams to Mr. Hoover for the hospital, do you pick a poor article out of a lot and sell the rest to other customers?—A. No, sir; I just give them to him as I have them; the same as to any other customer.

Q. You count them out of the pile without discrimination?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And have done that right straight along?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A statement, then, that this salt pork is of poor quality, and that the hams are tough or too salt, cannot but be a mistake?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That you know of your own knowledge?—A. I know it of my own knowledge.

Q. How long have you furnished Mr. Hoover with this salt meat?—A. Ever since last summer.

Q. What time last summer did you begin?—A. That I cannot say exactly; about the middle of the summer, I reckon.

Q. About July?—A. Yes, sir; perhaps before.

Q. Do you think it was before June?—A. It may have been before June, but how far before I cannot say.

Q. Have you any arrangement by which you receive any commission or percentage outside of the regular price for them?—A. No, sir.

Q. At what rate do you furnish hams?—A. I have been furnishing hams from eleven up to thirteen and fourteen cents.

Q. Is that as low as they can be sold in the market?—A. As low as they can be sold; the same as we get from any other wholesale trade.

Q. What do you sell the salt pork for?—A. For salt pork we get nine and ten cents.

Q. Is that as low as the wholesale trade will afford?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you think the government is dealt honestly with by Mr. Hoover in these articles in price, in quality, and in quantity?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find that the quantity furnished at different times varies considerably, or does it run along about the same?—A. It runs about the same.

WILBERT CLARY sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. Fruit and produce dealer.

Q. Are you a wholesale or a retail dealer?—A. Wholesale.

Q. Where is your place of business?—A. 923 Louisiana avenue.

Q. How long have you been in the business here?—A. Fourteen years.

Q. Do you know Dr. Palmer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you known him?—A. Perhaps twenty years; somewhere in that neighborhood.

Q. What has been the reputation Dr. Palmer has borne?—A. In Gardiner, Me., where I first knew him, it was A 1; I never heard a man say anything against him.

Q. What has it been since your knowledge?—A. No variation, no change.

Q. Do you furnish potatoes for the hospital?—A. I have sold potatoes to go to the hospital.

Q. At what time?—A. I think about all I furnished have been within

the last two or three years; not much before that time that I know of I do not remember before that time.

Q. What quality of potatoes do you furnish to the hospital?—A. I have always furnished the hospital with the best potatoes that I could get hold of, with one exception. Once I sent out a team with potatoes that were not up to the standard, and they were sent back to me.

Q. They were returned to you by Dr. Palmer?—A. Yes, sir; they were returned by Dr. Palmer.

Q. Are the potatoes that you furnished to the hospital, so far as size and quality are concerned, as good as those that you furnish your ordinary customers?—A. They are as good as are furnished my best customers; I do not say our ordinary customers, for we have a class of trade that takes nearly half the supply to hawk around through the streets. We receive double the consignments, I think, that are sold around in that way. Taking this into consideration, the potatoes sent to the hospital are a good deal ahead of these. The potatoes of the class he has got are of the very best, with that one exception. I sent out one load, and that load came from a cargo that I bought to arrive, and when it got here I objected to them on account of the size, and we finally compromised that at a reduction of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents a bushel, and I took the cargo. There were about 3,000 bushels of them, and Dr. Palmer was the only man who sent them back; he rejected them, so that his idea of potatoes and my idea was pretty nearly the same, only I took them at a reduction and he would not take them at all.

Q. Are the potatoes you send there of good size?—A. Yes, sir; with that one exception. Those were the only potatoes ever sent back.

Q. And those were not used in the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. What do you get for your potatoes?—A. They are running down some now. Potatoes are worth about 60 cents a bushel; good, fair quality of potatoes; that is, the wholesale bushel of 60 pounds. We have here a law for 56 pounds to the bushel, made by the territorial legislature we had a few years ago, and a good many are selling by that. He has always been very particular about the quantity. "Is this a 56-pound bushel or a 60-pound bushel?" And we have always insisted on the 60-pound bushel.

Q. The price at which you sell potatoes to the hospital varies with the price in the market, does it?—A. Yes, sir; that varies as the market goes up or down.

Q. Do you sell to Dr. Palmer for the hospital as low as you do to anybody else?—A. I have always had to sell low; in fact, my partner told me that a customer of that description was not of any account. I have had to sell to him as low as I sell to the lowest. In the first place, he is so particular on the quality. He wants the size, he wants the quality, and everything in that line. He asks questions as to the weight and everything else. Then I say, "I can get so and so." He says, "Well, I guess I can get them for so and so; if you can do better than that I will take the potatoes." That is the way of approaching.

Q. He beats you down and insists on measure and quality?—A. Yes, sir; he insists on the measure and quality and price. I never have oversold the market in any case to go to the hospital in my life.

Q. Have you any understanding or arrangement with him by which he is to receive any part of the price, or any percentage, or anything whatever?—A. No, sir; he never intimated to me either directly or indirectly that he ever would receive a cent benefit or I either.

Q. And no other person on his behalf?—A. No other person whatever.

Q. Did any one connected with the hospital ever do it?—A. No, sir; no one connected with the hospital or unconnected with the hospital.

Q. You are a wholesale dealer, and a friend of Dr. Palmer of long standing. Does the doctor ever consult you with reference to the prices of flour or other articles out of your line?—A. No; he did one time speak about some flour; that was some two years ago, I guess. I told him I was not a judge. He was speaking about flour advancing, or something of that kind; he did not ask my opinion any further particularly, but made a remark in a common kind of way; he asked for information, my idea was, and I merely made the remark that it was outside of my line and I could not tell very well. If it was something inside of my line, I could tell pretty well; as well as any one.

HENRY KAISER sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Baker.

Q. Where do you do business?—A. No. 1338 Sixth street, corner of O street.

Q. Do you do considerable business?—A. Not a great deal.

Q. Do you bake for any body except the hospital?—A. A few private customers.

Q. State the arrangement between yourself and the hospital about baking.—A. The arrangement I made with Dr. Glennan about five years ago. I receive the flour, and I deliver a pound of bread for a pound of flour.

Q. Does that arrangement still continue?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much profit is there to you in that arrangement between a pound of flour and a pound of bread?—A. It comes to a little over two dollars on a barrel.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Does that profit include the cost of baking?—A. I say two dollars a barrel is left.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. That is the compensation you get for baking the flour by the barrel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you deliver the bread to the hospital yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. The hospital sends for it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you send to the hospital a pound of bread for every pound of flour you get?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you weigh the bread?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. Are your loaves of uniform size?—A. Pretty much the same.

Q. Is there any arrangement by which you need not send so many pounds of bread as there are pounds of flour, any private understanding?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any private understanding by which you are to get more than the difference between the pound of bread and the pound of flour?—A. Not at all.

Q. Is there any understanding by which you share with Dr. Palmer or any other person any profit from your operations?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you bake up about the same amount of flour every month for the hospital? Does it run along about the same every month?—A. Not exactly. Sometimes they require fifteen loaves more a day, and of course it takes more then; sometimes less.

Q. What does that depend on; the number of patients?—A. I suppose so.

Q. You deliver as much as is ordered?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they always keep you supplied with flour enough to bake, or do you sometimes run out of flour of theirs?—A. They always keep me supplied with it.

Q. How much flour do you have on hand at any one time?—A. I get about twelve barrels at a time; sometimes less.

Q. How often do you get it?—A. At present I get it twice a month.

Q. Do you ever receive more than twelve barrels at one time?—A. Not to my recollection.

Q. When do they give their orders for the amount of bread they want for a particular day?—A. Sometimes they give an order to bake more and sometimes less.

Q. When is the order given?—A. The driver gives me the order whenever they want more or less.

Q. Is it the night before?—A. In the morning when he comes; the day before he gets it.

Q. Is the bread baked for the hospital under that arrangement as cheaply as it could be under any other?—A. Yes, sir; I think it is rather cheaper than it could be baked in other ways.

Q. Do you think it is as cheap as the hospital could bake its own bread?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. From whom do you receive this flour generally?—A. From Mr Galt.

Q. Does Mr. Galt deliver it directly to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you give a receipt for it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A written receipt?—A. He always sends a ticket and I sign my name to it.

Q. As to the number of barrels?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you deliver the bread to the driver for the hospital, do you do it on tickets, or do you take a receipt from him?—A. No, sir; he just gets the amount of bread they engage and that is all.

Q. You have no system of bookkeeping with him about the number of loaves?—A. No, sir; not with the driver. I keep a book for myself of what I deliver and what flour I get.

Q. You keep a memorandum of the number of loaves you deliver?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you settle your accounts at the end of the month?—A. We have not settled for the last two years. The flour and bread always pretty much run up together, almost even.

Q. You make no settlement then?—A. We have not made any for about two years. It comes near. It is not much over and not much less.

Q. What is the character of this flour that you receive from Galt?—A. The flour is always very good.

Q. Do you make good bread out of it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you always use the identical flour to make this bread, or do you use other flour sometimes?—A. I always use the same flour I get from Mr. Galt.

Q. Are you a general baker in the city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You bake for other people besides the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Dr. Palmer knows at the hospital how many pounds of flour you get? He orders the flour, does he not?—A. I suppose he orders it.

Q. You do not order the flour?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have nothing to do with ordering it?—A. No, sir.

Q. You simply receipt for it?—A. I only receipt for it.

Q. If the number of loaves you deliver corresponds with the number of pounds delivered to you, the account must be correct, must it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they know at the hospital how many pounds of bread they get?—A. I suppose they do.

Q. They vary the order, from day to day, as to the number of loaves they need?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Sometimes a few more and sometimes a few less?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That would show, would it not, that they know the number of loaves they get?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What kind of settlement did you make two years ago? How did you make settlement; by counting up the number of loaves and the number of pounds of flour?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any difference in the settlement?—A. None at all.

Q. How long before that had a settlement taken place?—A. Before that I had baked three years. That was before Dr. Palmer came there.

Q. So every once in two or three years you count up your loaves?—A. I always wait for the doctors; they let me know when they want a settlement, and they have never asked for any since, so, of course, I keep my own books, and, I suppose, they keep theirs.

Q. And, when you come to compare, you find that you agree?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You say the arrangement is that you give a pound of bread for a pound of flour?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that arrangement first made with the hospital?—A. Just when I first commenced baking for it, five years ago.

Q. With whom did you make it?—A. With Dr. Gleunan.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Some complaint has been made that last summer on some occasions the bread was sour. Do you know anything about that?—A. That might be once in a while that the bread has not been very sweet on account of the weather. That will happen sometimes. I only once had complaint from the hospital. That is all I can recollect.

Q. Did you have complaint last summer?—A. Only once.

Q. As far as you know, then, there was but one time. Is that so?—A. I could not say it was only one time.

Q. But as far as you know?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Who complained to you then?—A. Dr. Palmer. He wrote me a note that there had been complaint about the bread being a little sour, and he told me it would have to be remedied.

Q. Did you take care to remedy it?—A. Certainly.

THEODORE J. MAYER sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you a member of any firm in this city?—Answer. Of the firm of W. M. Galt & Co.

Q. Where do you do business?—A. At the corner of First street and Indiana avenue.

Q. Do you do a large business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Wholesale?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been established there, or in the city?—A. I shall have been a member of the firm three years next September, but I was clerk for the firm for about a year and a half before I became a member of the same.

Q. Is it an old-established firm?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. How long has the firm been established?—A. I suppose some thirteen or fifteen years; I cannot tell exactly.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. The firm does a large business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you furnish flour to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you furnished flour to it?—A. Since 1874.

Q. What kind of flour do you furnish?—A. We furnish to them high-grade family flours.

Q. To whom do you deliver the flour?—A. Mostly to the bakery of Henry Kaiser.

Q. Where is the rest delivered to?—A. Now and then they get a few barrels at the hospital for pastry purposes, I suppose.

Q. Do you furnish about the same amount of flour each month, or are there variations?—A. Sometimes it varies a little, according to the number of patients, I suppose, and then, again, sometimes they are out about the 27th or 28th of the month, and then they order, perhaps on the 27th or 28th, twelve barrels more, which is the usual complement, and of course that makes it for that month a larger delivery, and next month it is generally that much smaller.

Q. Suppose you take three months together. Will one period of three months average with another period of three months about?—A. I presume it would, unless they should have an unusually large number of patients at one time.

Q. Do you know anything about Dr. Palmer making a purchase of an extra amount of flour under the anticipation of its rising in price?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that, and what was it?—A. It was last spring I think, when flour was low, and the tendency was that flour would advance, and it did advance. I told Dr. Palmer that flour was about as low as it was going to be, and that I thought it would advance. We thought it would be an advantage to the hospital to engage a month's supply in advance. It was the first of the month. I told him that it undoubtedly would advance. He said, "Well, we do not want that flour delivered all at once; we want it delivered the same as usual." I told him it would not make a particle of difference about the time of delivery; he could engage what they wanted during the month; he could count up what they had had during the last month and give me the order for the same number of barrels, and I would deliver it to suit him at the rates which then existed. I suppose the hospital was benefited about seventy-five cents or a dollar a barrel by his making the purchase.

Q. It made the apparent purchase for that month pretty large?—A. I think it was pretty large, because he bought, perhaps, a few barrels more than he actually needed for that month.

Q. Then the subsequent month was there less bought?—A. I think there was.

Q. Can you make up and furnish to the committee a statement of the

amount of flour delivered for every month during the last year up to the 1st of January?—A. From January to January?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I will.

Q. And putting down the amount furnished each month and each delivery?—A. Yes, sir; I will have it prepared and furnished to the committee.

Q. What price do you get for the flour?—A. It varies with the market.

Q. Do you sell to the hospital as low as you do to any other customers buying at wholesale?—A. Just as low, and sometimes lower, because there seems to be a great deal of competition, everybody fighting to have the hospital as a customer, and consequently I have to cut very low.

Q. Do you know what means Dr. Palmer takes to get competition? Do you know whether he invites dealers to bid?—A. He invites dealers; he goes round to different houses and asks their prices, and whoever is the lowest man for the best quality of goods gets the order; and knowing that, I always cut low, so as to be enabled to get the order.

Q. And you know that the prices for which you sell are as low as or lower than the ordinary market prices?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any understanding or agreement on the part of Dr. Palmer by which more flour shall apparently be delivered than is actually delivered?—A. None whatever.

Q. Is there any understanding or agreement that he is to make any pecuniary profit out of that flour or his trading with you?—A. None whatever.

Q. And never has been?—A. Never has been.

Q. Has there been any such agreement or understanding with any person connected with the hospital?—A. None, to my knowledge.

Q. That you say on your oath and on your responsibility as a merchant?—A. I do.

JOHN A. HAMILTON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Of what firm are you a member?—Answer. Barbour & Hamilton.

Q. Where is your store?—A. On Louisiana avenue, between Sixth and Seventh streets.

Q. What goods do you deal in?—A. All kinds of groceries.

Q. Do you furnish goods to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. We do.

Q. How do you get the trade?—A. Through Dr. Palmer.

Q. Why does Dr. Palmer give it to your firm?—A. That is more than I can say, unless it is that he can buy cheaper from us than from any one else.

Q. Does he inquire your prices before doing it?—A. He does.

Q. What is his course of dealing in that respect, as far as you know?—A. He comes around and inquires the prices, and, I suppose, goes to other places and inquires.

Q. Do you sell to him as low for the hospital as you do to anybody?—A. We do. We sell at wholesale prices.

Q. Do you ever make him any presents?—A. Never.

Q. Or furnish him goods to his own house cheaper because he buys of you?—A. I do not think I ever furnished five dollars of goods to him for his own house.

Q. You do not deal with him for his own house?—A. He has bought a ham or two, I think.

Q. And paid for them?—A. Paid for them.

Q. The market-price?—A. The market-price.

Q. Do you furnish the hominy for the hospital?—A. We have furnished part of it.

Q. During the past year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What quality of hominy do you furnish?—A. Good; with the exception of one barrel which was returned a few days ago. That was good, but the grain was too large he said; nothing was amiss with the hominy except that it was too large in the grain.

Q. Have you ever, either by accident or design, furnished any musty hominy for the establishment?—A. No, sir.

Q. You always furnish a good article?—A. A good article, always.

Q. What other articles have you furnished?—A. Sugar, coffee, tea, canned goods, rice, bacon occasionally.

Q. Is the bacon good?—A. No. 1.

Q. Just as good as you sell to anybody?—A. The same quality we sell to our best customers.

Q. What is the article of coffee?—A. Rio.

Q. Is that a good article of coffee?—A. Choice Rio.

Q. What article of tea do you furnish?—A. Green and black.

Q. The same kind of tea you sell to your good customers?—A. The same as to our regular trade.

Q. Do you sell to the hospital as low as you do to your most favored customers?—A. As low as we do to any of our wholesale trade.

Q. And furnish as good articles?—A. As good articles.

Q. Do you furnish mackerel to the hospital?—A. We have furnished a few. Not recently. Very few mackerel have we furnished.

Q. Did you furnish any last summer?—A. We may have done it, but I do not remember.

Q. Do you do all the trade with the hospital, or part of it?—A. Part of it.

Q. What was the quality of the article of mackerel that you did furnish?—A. Good quality.

Q. What was the number?—A. No. 3.

Q. Is No. 3 used in families?—A. Yes, sir. Of course it is not the largest and finest mackerel. It is a grade of mackerel that almost all hospitals around town use.

Q. Do not many good families prefer No. 3 in size?—A. They do. A good No. 3, of course, is not as fat as a No. 1, but is just as good mackerel.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Are there not two kinds of No. 3 mackerel?—A. I believe there are half a dozen nowadays. They have a very small mackerel that they call No. 4 now.

Q. Are there half a dozen kinds of No. 3, or half a dozen kinds of numbers?—A. There are only No. 3 and No. 4 of the small-sized mackerel. The number threes are not all of the same size. This year's catch No. 3 has been very small—smaller than we usually have them.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is your mackerel inspected by anybody, or do you go by the inspectors' marks on the barrels?—A. It is inspected in Boston, when put up.

Q. Do you ever have any mackerel returned to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find the brands of mackerel reliable generally?—A. Not always. We often have to return them to Boston. Last year there were a great many poor mackerel in the market and we returned several hundred barrels to Boston.

CALVIN WITMER sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you in business in this city?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?—A. No. 1918 Pennsylvania avenue.

Q. In what business?—A. General grocery business.

Q. Do you deal with the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; we have been selling them goods.

Q. During the last year or two?—A. For three years, I think.

Q. What goods do you furnish the hospital?—A. We have sold them mackerel, hominy, beans, sugar sometimes, and coffee, and salt.

Q. What kind of mackerel do you furnish them?—A. No. 3.

Q. Do you furnish them out of the same lots that you do other customers?—A. The same that we sell for family trade.

Q. Do families complain much of those mackerel that you sell?—A. We have never had any complaint at all of No. 3. Of course we sell a good many No. 1 mackerel. They are fat. Still a great many persons buy No. 3; they are smaller, and some persons prefer them. They are not so oily, and they broil nicely. There is a difference of about \$10 a barrel in the price.

Q. The No. 3 are cheaper?—A. Ten dollars a barrel less.

Q. And families to whom you supply them consider them a good article? That is, they do not complain of them?—A. We have people who use them from one season to another, and we never have old or rusty ones.

Q. Do you ever use No. 3 yourself?—A. I frequently use No. 3.

Q. Of the same quality you furnish the hospital?—A. The same quality. We only keep one brand of No. 3.

Q. Do you find at your own table that these mackerel are good or bad?—A. They are good; they are not rusty.

Q. You say you furnish hominy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There has been a complaint that hominy furnished for the hospital during the last year was musty. Do you furnish musty hominy?—A. I never heard any complaint from the hospital. They never made any complaint to me. I sent them the same brand I have standing open in my store. We sell it to the best families in the first ward, southern hominy, some of it made in Alexandria, Va. It is the best. It is about the kind I send out.

Q. Are you a large dealer? Do you deal pretty extensively with families, &c., in the city?—A. Yes, sir; we have an extensive trade. We have been in business there about fifteen or sixteen years.

Q. Do you sell to the government for the Freedmen's Hospital as low as you do to other parties?—A. I think I trim the prices a little closer. We appreciate that trade, because it is cash every month, and there is no other trade in the city that is that way. It is cash the first of the month, and we appreciate that; and, of course, to retain it we offer inducements. Other trade, we sometimes have a promise of pay in thirty or sixty days, and sometimes we have to wait four months. Of course we appreciate the government trade, and to keep it we sell a little closer than we do to other parties.

Q. Aside from selling a little closer, at a little lower price, what other inducements do you offer to anybody to get that trade?—A. We never offered any other inducement.

Q. Did Dr. Palmer ever try to intimate to you in any way that you ought to make him some present or some return for trading with you?—A. Not the least insinuation of that kind.

Q. And nobody on his behalf?—A. Nothing of the kind, directly or indirectly.

Q. You never made him any present or promise?—A. Never made him any promise or present.

Q. And to no one else connected with the institution?—A. No one else connected with the institution.

Q. You deal with the government by furnishing articles as low as the market will allow, and deal honestly with it?—A. Yes, sir. All articles are weighed carefully, and I generally give supervision to those things myself to see that the weight and everything is correct, both in quality and quantity.

WILLIAM DIX sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your business?—Answer. Butter-dealer.

Q. Where do you do business?—A. In the market exclusively.

Q. What is the number of your stall?—A. Three hundred and sixteen, Centre Market.

Q. Are you doing a large trade or a small one there?—A. I think I do a pretty good trade.

Q. What is the character of your customers?—A. First class.

Q. Do you sell butter to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I do.

Q. Any other article?—A. Butter and eggs.

Q. What is the quality of the butter you sell?—A. Good; such as I retail off my stand to private families.

Q. At what price do you sell butter to the hospital?—A. Twenty-five cents a pound.

Q. What do you sell that butter for at retail?—A. Thirty-five cents.

Q. What do you sell eggs for?—A. Eggs fluctuate in price. We retail them to-day at 18 cents a dozen; we sell them wholesale at 15 cents.

Q. Do you sell about the same amount of eggs in one week that you do in another to the hospital?—A. About the same; their orders are about the same.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Do you deliver at the hospital or deliver at the stand?—A. I deliver at the hospital.

Q. Your own wagon carries them out?—A. Yes, sir; my own wagon.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You sell the same quality of eggs to the hospital that you do to your other customers?—A. The same quality.

Q. And as low as they can be sold in the market?—A. Yes, sir. I am prepared to do it, and do do it.

Q. Have you any arrangement with any party by which more eggs are charged for than are delivered?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are all the eggs all delivered at the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. None delivered at the house of any officer of the institution?—A. None, sir.

Q. Nor at any other place?—A. No, sir. The question I ask when my man comes back, is, if everything is all right, and if they are all delivered to the steward? The answer is they are all right in count and weight.

Q. There is no private arrangement between you and any officer of the institution?—A. No, sir; not the slightest.

WILLIAM DE MOTT sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your business?—Answer. Our business is ostensibly clothing; but we deal in general merchandise.

Q. What is the name of your firm?—A. For the last two years William Wall. I have been interested there.

Q. Your place of business is 921 Pennsylvania avenue?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you furnish any articles to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; we have done so.

Q. What have you furnished?—A. Articles of clothing, such as coats, blouses, stockings, and more or less cotton cloth, ticking, and goods of that character.

Q. Do you furnish the articles which you sell to the government as low as you do to any other parties?—A. Yes, sir. I will explain to you that we have had for several years past, until the present year, the contract for supplying the Washington Asylum or Almshouse, and, as everybody knows, we have to bid very low to get it, and I have always, in endeavoring to sell to Dr. Palmer, sold him at the contract-prices that we furnished the asylum, which are very low indeed. We buy the goods for cash; we buy them so close that we only get one per cent. off for net cash; and we furnish them to the hospital at a margin of at no time more than ten per cent., and very often at five per cent. above net cost. Dr. Palmer, I will say, buys from us lower than any government institution that we have ever sold goods to; and we have sold to almost all of them about the city.

Q. Does Dr. Palmer seem to be solicitous to get things at a low price?—A. Very; and it has been a question with us sometimes whether it was worth while to supply the hospital. It was simply a matter of cash transaction, or it would not have been profitable to sell to him.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. He pays you promptly?—A. We are paid promptly at the end of the month. The money is always forthcoming at the end of the month, and being a cash transaction, we were always ready to make the transaction.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Does he inspect the goods that you deliver?—A. Yes, sir; always. I might say I have sold him a number of blankets, several hundred pairs of blankets. On the last we delivered him, I think, our profit was only 25 cents a pair, and they were the "silver-grey" blankets furnished us from H. B. Clafin & Co. and A. T. Stewart & Co.; and we have always had to examine the entire market in order to buy them low enough to be able to furnish them. Blankets went up on us last fall, and I had an agreement to furnish him one hundred pairs of blankets, and I think we did not make anything on the last fifty pairs. I have the bills of everything we have furnished him.

Q. Have you any arrangement or understanding with Dr. Palmer by which he is to receive any benefit personally from this trade?—A. In no way; not one dollar, or one cent.

Q. Or with any officer or person connected with the institution?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Is there any discount on your bills?—A. No, sir. I should like to say—as I have made an affidavit that is on file somewhere, I suppose,

to the effect that a certain party, by the name of O. S. B. Wall, did at one time receive from a former member of our firm a consideration for what he claimed to be his influence in influencing the hospital trade—that I believe that was before Dr. Palmer was in charge of the hospital. The way that came about was this: when Mr. Robinson left our firm and the business of the firm came under my control exclusively, I had the management then of all the collection of the outstanding accounts and the settlement of all the indebtedness and the general management of the business. I found on the books of the firm of Wall, Robinson & Co., as it had been, a charge against O. S. B. Wall, and when I presented the account for settlement and insisted on a settlement of the account, and sued him before a justice of the peace for a settlement of the account, he then, and not till then, came forward and claimed that this matter of \$40 was to be given him in consideration of his having influenced the trade of the hospital. That was the first Mr. Wall or myself knew of anything being paid, or any promise being made for any influence that might be used for soliciting trade.

Q. When was this?—A. This was about a year and a half ago that I pressed the claim.

Q. But what was the date of the account?—A. The account dates back somewhere in 1874, I think. I do not remember, but our books would show.

Q. That was before Dr. Palmer was there?—A. I think it was before Dr. Palmer was there.

Q. Who is O. S. B. Wall?—A. He is a colored man, a justice of the peace. That is all I know of him.

Q. Whom did he claim he had made this arrangement with?—A. With Mr. Robinson.

Q. But at the hospital? How did he exercise this influence?—A. He did not say what parties. He said for his influence with the hospital. He did not name any parties.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you know whether O. S. B. Wall is the person whose name has been mentioned as one of those who have thought the affairs of the hospital were badly managed at present?—A. I presume it to be the same man.

Q. You have heard him discussed in that capacity?—A. Yes, sir; I have heard him discussed as being one of the parties who were making complaints, and it was accidentally that I mentioned this matter in my transactions with Dr. Palmer, and he requested me to make an affidavit to the fact, and I did so.

Q. Is that the affidavit that you made (handing him a paper)?—A. (Examining.) This is the one.

The affidavit is as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington County, ss:

On this 15th day of January, A. D. 1878, before me, the subscriber, a notary public in and for the District aforesaid, personally appeared William De Mott, who being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangely of Almighty God, did depose and say that on or about the 16th day of March, 1876, said deponent became the business agent of William Wall, of Washington City, and with the collection of outstanding accounts of the late firm of Wall & Robinson of said city, then recently dissolved; that, among others, there was one against O. S. B. Wall (colored) of \$40, who, when sued on said account, presented a receipt given him by Robinson, of the late firm, which did not correspond with the cash account of the late firm, there being no such credit given the said Wall thereon; that said Wall informed this deponent that he had received the goods charged in said account from Robinson in consideration of his

(Wall's) influencing the trade of Freedmen's Hospital to the late firm of Wall & Robinson.

WILLIAM DE MOTT.

Subscribed and sworn before me.

[L. S.]

JOHN T. C. CLARK,
Notary Public.

Q. The contents of that affidavit are true?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With the exception of this affair of O. S. B. Wall, you know nothing of anybody ever claiming that he had anything for his influence for furnishing goods to the hospital?—A. In no way, and I am certain not with our house, because we never in any way offered or tendered to Dr. Palmer anything or he to us. He is so close in his dealings that he once went with me to Baltimore; I asked him to go, so that I might convince him that I was furnishing the goods as low as it was possible for them to be bought. I took him to Baltimore and introduced him to houses that we were dealing with, without their knowing anything about it, so that he might understand and know that he was getting the things at the very bottom prices.

Q. Have you stated what became of this claim of O. S. B. Wall? Was he allowed the creditor not?—A. He claimed it, and when it came to suit he was allowed credit for it.

Q. Did the justice before whom it was tried allow him credit for influence in procuring government trade to be given to you?—A. No, sir, he did not. I will tell you how it happened. He went before the justice of the peace and made this explanation. The justice sent for me, and I went there and he told me of it. I then explained the matter to Mr. Wall, and we decided that it would be better to close the account than to have any trouble about it, as it would necessitate Mr. Wall's subpoenaing the former member of the firm with whom he was then having some trouble, in fact a lawsuit; and sooner than subpoena him as a witness to testify in the case, we decided to lose the \$10 and close the account.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You carried it to profit and loss?—A. Yes, sir; we lost the account.

J. B. JOHNSON recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. You are treasurer of the Howard University?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know anything about a piece of iron pipe that was used by Dr. Palmer at his residence?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the history of that pipe?—A. It was a piece of old pipe that belonged to the university which he said he would like to have, and I gave him permission to take it.

Q. It did not belong to the government?—A. It did not belong to the government. It belonged to the university.

Q. Was there any discussion between you and him as to the price?—A. No, sir; it was an old pipe and was hardly salable. It could not be sold to first-class plumbers. He said he could use it and I told him to take it.

Q. A piece of old pipe, that belonged to the university, in your charge?—A. Yes, sir. This conversation occurred before he moved the pipe. He had my permission to take it before he took it.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You never thought of asking him a quarter of a dollar for it, I suppose?—A. No, sir.

FRIDAY, *March 1, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

Sister BEATRICE DUFFY sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with one of the hospitals in this city ?—

Answer. I have charge of Providence Hospital.

Q. How long have you had charge of it ?—A. Eight years.

Q. Did you have as an inmate of that hospital, as a patient at one time, Franklin E. Felton ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know him pretty well, do you ?—A. Yes, sir, I know him.

Q. What was Mr. Felton's conduct in Providence Hospital ?—A. It was rather eccentric at times, but we considered him a person of unsound mind, and did not pay much regard to his behavior. With the sisters he was very agreeable ; but with the patients he was exceedingly disagreeable while there.

Q. In what manner was he eccentric ?—A. His whole conduct was eccentric. He made use of very profane language at times with the patients, and acted in a very disagreeable manner with them. We always considered him as of unsound mind, and did not pay any regard to his conduct.

Q. Did he make any complaint of the hospital ?—A. No, sir ; he seemed perfectly satisfied while he was there.

Q. Did you write him a letter inviting him to come back, after he left ?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was any such letter sent on behalf of the institution ?—A. No, sir. His brother wrote to me from Philadelphia, requesting me to receive him back if he should present himself there, as he supposed he would.

Q. On what ground did the brother ask you to receive him ?—A. On the same conditions that he was there formerly. He was there as a pay patient. He was not there free.

Q. Who paid his expenses ?—A. His brother, or rather his step-brother, in Philadelphia.

Q. Did his brother freely furnish him with money ?—A. He never gave him any money. He always sent it to me ; he would not give him any money at all. He did not think him capable of making good use of it. He paid his expenses in the hospital. I have letters showing that he was perfectly willing to support him as long as he would remain in the hospital, but he would give him no money outside of the hospital.

Q. Did he state any reason for not giving him any money outside of the hospital ?—A. He stated to me that he did not think he would make proper use of it. I supposed that he was inclined to be dissipated in his habits. That was the idea I formed of him.

Q. Have you those letters with you ?—A. I have three ; but I had another one. I lent it to Dr. Palmer one day and he did not return it to me. I had a great number of letters that I had received from his brother while he was in the hospital, that I did not keep. Those I have are letters I received after he left the hospital.

Dr. G. S. PALMER recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What became of the letter which was given to you by Sister Beatrice ?—Answer. I gave it to the Secretary of the Interior, stating that it was a private letter. However, I have not been to him for it yet.

Sister BEATRICE DUFFY recalled :

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. [After examining.] This letter of June 12, 1877, from his brother, which you have handed me, says :

I am sincerely glad that Mr. F. E. Felton's threatened lawsuit came to nothing ; that he has ceased to annoy you.

That is directed to you. What was that " threatened lawsuit " ?—Answer. He claimed an overcoat that he said he brought there. No person had any knowledge of the overcoat ; and he sent some one over to tell me that if we did not return the value of it back, which he claimed to be about \$23, he would enter suit.

Q. Did he begin a suit ?—A. Yes, sir ; he sued us.

Q. What became of the suit ?—A. I put it in the hands of a lawyer and told him to settle it, and he settled it. I had to pay \$10 for the trouble the lawyer took with him.

Q. As to the letter dated Philadelphia, January 2, 1878, which you have handed me, have you any objection to my reading it ?—A. No, sir ; you can read them all.

Q. It is :

To Sister Beatrice, Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C. :

RESPECTED MADAM : Mr. S. M. Felton is out of town. He much regrets to hear, I know, that his poor sick half-brother has ever caused you trouble after all the kindness with which you have treated him when under your charge. The New York Times yesterday had a long account of the commotion he has raised at the Freedmen's Hospital. We have every confidence that the honorable Secretary of the Interior will probe the matter fully, and do ample justice to all concerned. Awaiting his verdict,

I am, with great respect, your obedient servant,

E. F. BARKER.

Q. Who is Mr. Barker ?—A. The brother-in-law of Mr. Felton. He acts as Mr. Felton's secretary in Philadelphia. The gentleman in Philadelphia is a very wealthy gentleman, and a very nice gentleman, I think. He has a brother also in California, a gentleman of ample means, and who would be very willing to take care of this man if he would only behave himself properly with the family. That is what they wrote to me after they found he was not with us.

The other letter, which the doctor did not return to me, is more explanatory about his affairs.

Q. The letter I have read speaks of the trouble he has caused you after your kindness to him. What particular trouble is referred to ?—A. That was the lawsuit. When he threatened to sue us I immediately wrote to his brother in Philadelphia, and told him what Mr. Felton proposed doing, and to please let me know if he had an overcoat when he left home. It is the answer to that letter of mine that Dr. Palmer still retains, stating what articles he gave him.

Q. Was there any overcoat ?—A. No, sir ; we never found any. No person had any knowledge of one at all.

Q. How happened he to leave your hospital ?—A. He thought he was well enough to go into business for himself, so he informed us, and wanted to go in business in the city as an agent for some insurance company.

Q. I understood him to state in his testimony that he left because he could not get at Providence Hospital the attention he needed of a male nurse.—A. That is false. He had a male nurse all the time that he was there. Of course we have male nurses in the male ward. He left the hospital and immediately wrote to his brother to send him money ; that

he was so far recovered now he thought he was able to go into business for himself. His brother immediately wrote back to me and told me that he was very sorry to hear he had left the hospital, and that he had written to him for money, which he would not give him. He would never give him one cent outside the hospital, and he supposed he would come back to it, and, if so, to please receive him. He may possibly mean that I called that a letter of invitation to come back. When he wrote about suing me, I answered him and told him that I knew nothing about his overcoat, and that his brother had written me to the effect I have just stated. Perhaps he may have taken that as an invitation to come back. I merely told him what his brother had said, that he was willing to support him if he would return there.

Q. Did you receive any draft on San Francisco, on account of Felton, from any one?—A. No, sir. When he first came to Providence Hospital he presented himself as destitute; he had no money at all, but he told me he had ample means and could get it in a few days if we would trust him. I did not believe in that very much, but I took him in; he was very sick at the time—paralyzed. In a few days he gave me a draft on San Francisco on his brother. I left it in the Bank of Washington to have it collected. They sent it on, but it would not be acknowledged. Then I wrote to his brother in Philadelphia, as he told me he had a brother there, to see if there was any truth in his statements. The brother wrote me back that he was willing to support him and very glad to find he was there; that he was an unfortunate person who had given them trouble for the last twenty years, and that if we would keep him in the hospital, he would pay his expenses there as long as we kept him, and he did pay them very faithfully. You will perceive by one of these letters that he speaks of putting him in a private room. He became so troublesome in the ward and so annoying to the other patients that we could not keep him in the ward, and I wrote to his brother to ask him if he would authorize me to put him in a private room, as it would be a little additional expense. He wrote me back and told me yes—anything to satisfy him and keep him quiet.

Dr. P. GLENNAN recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Was Franklin E. Felton at any time a patient in your ward?—Answer. Yes, sir; he was when he first entered the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. What ward was yours?—A. No. 1.

Q. Was he sent to any other ward?—A. He was sent to ward No. 2 in July, I think.

Q. For what reason?—A. There were a couple of patients in the ward that he had some difficulty with. There was a sick man that annoyed him, and he cursed about this man for disturbing him in the night. The man complained about it. The thing passed over. I did not say anything to him at that time about it. The man died in a short time. Some time afterward the same thing occurred with another patient. Felton cursed and damned and abused him for disturbing him by coughing; so I rebuked him very severely, and he asked to be removed. I moved him into ward 2.

Q. That was the occasion of the removal?—A. That was the cause of the removal. He asked to be removed. It was on account of those two occurrences. I talked to him pretty sharply for abusing those two patients.

COLLINS CRUSOR sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer. I am not.

Q. Have you ever been?—A. Never.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am an officer at the United States jail.

Q. Where do you live?—A. I live in Georgetown.

Q. Do you know Robert T. Johnson?—A. I do.

Q. How long have you known him?—A. I have known him for the last fifteen or twenty years.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. From his boyhood, I suppose, judging from his appearance?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What do you know of Robert T. Johnson, as to his mode of life and character in the past?—A. I know at one time we had him in prison there, and I have known him since then. I have traced him through. I had lost sight of him for probably four or five years, but as I have known him generally, his reputation has been very bad in the community where he lived.

Q. What was he in jail for?—A. I cannot really think now. I did not think to look at the records. I did not know I was coming here for any purpose of this kind.

Q. Do you know whether he was at any time connected with the fire department?—A. I do.

Q. What position did he hold in the fire department?—A. I think he was a fireman there.

Q. Have you ever visited the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I have.

Q. How often?—A. I think about half a dozen times, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. Have you been there since last July?—A. I have.

Q. Were you there on one occasion when the matter was under discussion between Felton and others whether the fish furnished to them was good or bad?—A. I was. I was there on private business with Dr. Purvis, and he asked me to walk through the wards with him to see the condition of the hospital. I did so; and, as we neared the door, I think, of Dr. Purvis's ward, some one told him that there was a complaint lodged about the fish that they had that morning for breakfast; that it was tainted, bad fish. The doctor said nothing, but carried me through the different parts of the wards, and afterwards got me to go with him to the kitchen, and visit the kitchen. He asked the cook to give him some of the fish that was sent up for breakfast that morning. He brought out some of the fish, just pulled it up, and asked me to examine it. I did not know what for. I looked at the fish. The fish was perfectly sweet. After getting me through with the fish, he carried me to the barrel that the fish had come out of, and he got the cook there to hook the fish up, and the fish was perfectly sweet. I took one fish, tore it in two, and smelled it. It was perfectly sweet. I also examined the meat and bread, and every thing seemed to be in perfect condition—in good order. I could not find any fault whatever.

Q. Do you know Capt. O. S. B. Wall?—A. I do.

Q. Did you ever have a conversation with Capt. O. S. B. Wall with

reference to what he had against Dr. Purvis or Dr. Palmer?—A. We had several conversations.

Q. As to his intention to break up the hospital or the Colored Orphans' Home?—A. Yes, sir; I have had several talks with him about that matter.

Q. State when they were and what was said?—A. I cannot exactly state the date, for I paid no attention to the dates. I had no idea I would be called in question in relation to my talk with Wall.

Q. What did he say with reference to that matter?—A. Squire Wall seemed to be dissatisfied because they did not give him a certain portion of the patronage of that department to which he thought he was entitled, from the fact that he helped to get the first man out from there, Dr.—I forget his name—who was before Dr. Palmer.

Q. Reyburn?—A. That was the name. He said he helped to get Dr. Palmer there, and he thought he was entitled to patronage; but they had taken away the milk from him, and he was dissatisfied and intended to do what he could to put Dr. Palmer out.

Q. Did he say anything about Dr. Purvis in that connection?—A. I do not recollect his saying anything about Dr. Purvis. [A pause.] Yes, I think he said, too, that Dr. Purvis could do something for him, but would not.

Q. His complaint against these gentlemen was that they would not give him part of the patronage after he had assisted in getting one of them in the place or in getting Reyburn out?—A. That is what I understood from him.

WILLIAM H. WEST (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I am a member of the Metropolitan police force of this district.

Q. Where do you reside?—A. 1025 Third street northwest.

Q. Do you know Robert Johnson, or Robert T. Johnson, who is now in the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I do, very well.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to arrest him?—A. Yes, sir; I had occasion to raid his house as a disorderly house, a house of prostitution, of which he had appeared to have been the proprietor.

Q. Did you find him there?—A. Yes, sir; he made his escape that night. He was in the house when we raided it, but he made his escape by a door of which another officer was in charge, and we arrested him the following day.

Q. When was that?—A. That was on or about five years ago. I cannot remember the particular year, but it was on or about five years ago.

Q. (Handing a paper.) There is a reference in the Evening Star of this city of May 16, 1873, in the article which is marked. I hand it to you. Is that it?—A. (Examining.) This is the occasion.

Q. Read the item, and see if that describes the circumstance.—A. (Examining.) Yes, sir; that is the time. The house was situated immediately in the rear of Dr. Purvis's residence, in what was known as Green alley, between L street and Massachusetts avenue and 13th and 14th streets. The article is:

ALLEGED DISREPUTABLE HOUSE.—For some time past complaints have been made by many respectable residents in the northern portion of the city of the character of a house in an alley between 13th and 14th streets and L street and Massachusetts avenue, and last night Major Richards gave an order to Lieutenant Eckloff, of the sixth precinct, to make a raid on it, which that officer proceeded to do, and took into custody Alice Johnson and Robert Johnson (foreman of the hook and ladder company),

Emma Brooks, Maggie Lewis, Mary Johnson, Caroline Smith, and Thomas Sudden, all colored, and locked them up. This morning the case was continued, the two alleged principals, Robert and Alice Johnson, giving \$300, and the others \$100, each for a hearing to-morrow.

Q. You assisted in making that raid?—A. I did.

Q. And arrested those parties?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what became of the case?—A. I think we failed to establish sufficient evidence to show that Johnson was proprietor, and I think after having given bonds, this woman, Alice Johnson, whom he was connected with there apparently, made her escape from Washington on her bond.

Q. Is Alice Johnson a young woman or old woman?—A. She is a young woman.

Q. A relative of Robert?—A. No relative. I think he was living with her as her friend, at this house.

CHARLES R. VERNON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I am lieutenant of the Metropolitan Police of this District.

Q. How long have you been?—A. I have been on the police force since the 11th day of September, 1861.

Q. Do you know Robert T. Johnson, a colored man in the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I know Robert T. Johnson. I do not know where he is.

Q. Is he a colored man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever have any official duty in connection with him?—A. Yes, sir; on one occasion. There was a tobacco store on Seventh street near the corner of E street robbed. Some 8,000 or 10,000 cigars and some tobacco were stolen. We got information of the party who carried the stuff, and that he sold it to Robert Johnson. We went up to search his house and asked him for the stuff. He persistently denied knowing anything about the transaction; said he had not seen the cigars and knew nothing about the matter. We searched the house and failed to find them. I got information a little later in the night that the cigars were there. I went back and searched a second time with the same success—did not find them. The same party informed me later still that the cigars were there, and he located them pretty well. He had them hid in the yard in an old sideboard, I think. I went there and found the covers of the cigars. He was arrested for receiving stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen, carried before the police court, and sent to jail for the grand jury. This was on the 9th day of December, 1874.

PERRY H. CARSON (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. 113 Virginia avenue, southwest.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am in the marshal's office.

Q. How long have you been connected with the marshal's office?—A. One year.

Q. Do you know Robert T. Johnson?—A. I do.

Q. How long have you known him?—A. About six or seven years, perhaps longer.

Q. What do you know of his character for veracity and uprightness?—A. It is very bad.

Q. Do you speak of his general reputation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you had any official connection with him?—A. We have had business together in politics, and I have known him on several occasions at meetings, when he said he hoped he might be paralyzed if he would not do so and so. I do not think he is worthy of belief on his oath.

Q. You mean that he is a rough customer?—A. Yes, sir.

JAMES LEONARD (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. Fifty-eight C street, north-west.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Driver of the prison-van for the marshal's office.

Q. Do you know Robert T. Johnson?—A. Yes, sir; five or six years.

Q. What do you know about him?—A. I do not know anything very bad about him, and nothing very good.

Q. Do you know what his business has been?—A. I know he was on the fire department awhile.

Q. Has he kept any place of business to your knowledge?—A. He kept a restaurant awhile.

Q. Do you know anything about his reputation for truth and veracity?—A. I do not know myself. I have heard it spoken of as not being very good.

Q. Have you had any occasion yourself to arrest him or assist in his arrest?—A. No, sir. I know when he was arrested.

RICHARD MARSHALL (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where do you live?—Answer. Eleventh street, between Q and R, No. 1631.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I have kept a restaurant for the last seven or eight years, until the last three months, when I was burned out.

Q. Do you know Robert T. Johnson?—A. I do.

Q. What do you know about his character?—A. It is pretty bad. I have done business with him. He and I were together in business once. He got himself in trouble about some tobacco and cigars. My wife was home very low, expecting to die, and I went home to attend to her and in that time Johnson bought these cigars, and the officers came and searched for these cigars. Johnson said the cigars were not there. The cook told me the cigars were there, and the officer came to me and told me he was going to arrest me if I did not show up these cigars. I told him I knew nothing about them; I had not been there from Sunday evening. I went to Johnson and asked him about the cigars. He said yes, he had the old cigars, and he would be damned if he should have them. I said to him, "Then I shall not have anything to do with them, and if they ask me anything more about it, I shall tell them you have the cigars, and must let them have them." On that, I left.

Q. You need not go into these details. What is his general reputation for truth?—A. I would not believe him on no consideration at all.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. The question is not whether you would believe him, but what is his general reputation?—A. Very bad.

Q. Among people who speak of him and know him?—A. Very bad among everybody that knows him, pretty much.

JAMES A. MCDEVITT sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your business ?—Answer. I am a detective-officer of the Metropolitan police of this District.

Q. How long have you been ?—A. About sixteen years, I judge.

Q. What is your present residence ?—A. No. 509 Seventh street Southwest.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Robert Johnson or Robert T. Johnson, a colored man ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you known him ?—A. I have known him for many years.

Q. Have you ever had any duties in connection with your official position concerning him ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ?—A. In reference to one occasion to a robbery of a cigar-store ; the goods were found in his house.

Q. Was he arrested ?—A. He was.

Q. Do you know of any other occasion ?—A. I cannot say positively. I have not looked the records over. I intended to do so, but I was prevented by death in my family. I was notified of it about twelve o'clock, and I gave up this matter to attend to that, and I was also called as a witness in the District Commissioners' room.

Q. Do you know the general character of Johnson in this community ?—A. Well, he is a man that kept a drinking-house where all classes of people used to go, and I judge a gambling-house also.

Q. What is his reputation for truth and uprightness ?—A. I would not like to state it.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. What do you mean when you say you judge a gambling-house ?—A. I have heard it stated.

Q. Was he ever arrested for gambling, or the house ever raided as a gambling-house ?—A. I will not say positively whether it has been or not.

CHARLES A. ROBY sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with the Freedmen's Hospital ?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity ?—A. In charge of the watch, and the carpenter's work, repairing generally.

Q. How long have you been there ?—A. About eighteen months.

Q. Do you know Mr. Potter who has testified in this case ?—A. Yes, sir ; I know him.

Q. Has Mr. Potter ever given you any message to Dr. Palmer about the payment of money to stop this investigation ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was it, and when ?—A. It was at the first of the investigation they had there on the premises. Potter came out to me at the gate and said, "Those doctors are quite a set of blockheads." I asked him why he thought so. He says "For allowing this thing to go on." Says he, "If Dr. Palmer will send Mr. Riddle to Mr. Felton the thing can be stopped for \$500." I remarked to him that probably Mr. Felton would not accept the offer, and he said, in so many words, that it was understood between him and Felton that he was to make that proposition to Dr. Palmer.

Q. That took place at the gate of the hospital ?—A. At the gate of the hospital.

Q. What is the condition of Mr. Potter so far as health is concerned, or what has it been; has he been accustomed to go out?—A. He goes out upon all occasions, wet and dry. He is out every night until 8 o'clock. No weather, scarcely, stops him. His health appears to be very good.

Q. Do you know Mr. Calvert?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What place does he hold there?—A. He is engineer at the hospital.

Q. Did Mr. Calvert make any statement as to the condition in which he would leave the hospital in case he left there?—A. He did on one occasion. He said if he was to leave, and knew he had to leave, he would put the engine in such condition that it would not be of much use.

Q. When was that?—A. That was, I think, during the investigation, a little before or after, I am not certain. I cannot recall the time. It was during the investigation.

Q. How happened he to speak of his being compelled to leave there?—A. I really do disremember the occurrence so far as his speaking of the trouble of leaving. It was some little trouble existed there. I do not know in regard to it.

Q. Have you been a patient at the hospital?—A. I was a patient there a while.

Q. For how long a time?—A. For three or four months.

Q. When?—A. Last year.

Q. Last summer?—A. No, sir; not last summer, last winter; this winter twelve months.

Q. What was your treatment at the hospital?—A. It was very good.

Q. What kind of food did you get?—A. The food was good enough, I thought. I never found any fault.

Q. In what condition were the wards kept, clean or otherwise?—A. The wards were kept in a very good condition indeed. I had an opportunity to know; they were kept as genteelly as they possibly could be. I do not know what else they could do unless they put carpet on the floors and frescoed the walls.

Q. That is the only thing you can think of to add to the cleanliness?—A. Yes, sir; from the way they constructed the building.

Q. You mean that everything was kept scrupulously clean?—A. Very clean and nice. They are constantly scrubbing and cleaning up the walls and so on. I have seen them at it three or four times a week.

Q. Do you have occasion to visit the wards now?—A. Yes, sir; I occasionally visit some of the wards.

Q. You go about them still?—A. I go about them; there is always something more or less to do about the wards.

Q. In the way of carpentering and so forth?—A. In the way of carpentering and seeing to one thing and another.

Q. Is the hospital kept in the same condition now as it was a year ago?—A. There is no difference between a year ago and the present time that I can see.

Q. During the visits you have made to the wards during the last two or three months, do you know or have you seen yourself or observed any efforts made to induce patients to testify one way or the other, with reference to this examination, by anybody?—A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. By whom and under what circumstances?—A. Well, during the last investigation they had upon the premises.

Q. Do you mean the investigation held by the doctors from the Interior Department?—A. The doctors from the Interior Department.

During that I saw, I do not know exactly what you term it. Have you never been to a Southern country barbecue?

Mr. SARGENT. I never have.

The WITNESS. It was something equal to that. Felton would write down what he would want certain witnesses to swear to the night previous, and they would be examined the next day. He would school them at night. I know that. I have seen it.

Q. Instruct them in what they knew?—A. He would tell them what he would require them to swear to the next day. He would do it overnight.

Q. Would they make any objection, whether they knew it or not?—A. Some did and some did not. I know some that did make objection.

Q. Was the objection accepted as good?—A. The statements were modified and put through.

Q. Did you ever see Dr. Palmer or Dr. Purvis doing that?—A. No, sir; I did not. I never saw Dr. Purvis nor one of the doctors in that hospital do anything of the kind. In fact, during the last investigation out there everybody was afraid; it was a kind of a mob concern for thirty days. This man Felton would come down the street to where they held the investigation and would generally make a speech when he would get down to the ward, and he would have all the niggers in the place around him. They would show him to his ward and he would make a kind of stump speech that he had them, and all this kind of stuff.

Q. "That he had them," and what else?—A. That he had the doctors.

Q. You say that everybody seemed to be afraid. Afraid of what?—A. They had a kind of dangerous set there. There were two or three Irishmen, and several around there who were actually dangerous men. I was afraid of them myself. I had to take charge of the gate during the concern. I was alarmed some evenings myself when this thing would be over.

Q. On which side were these dangerous people?—A. They were all with Felton and in opposition to Dr. Palmer. The whole place was almost in a rush at the time.

Q. Meanwhile were the doctors doing their duty in the hospital?—A. They were.

Q. Attending to the patients?—A. Attending to the patients as regularly as they do now.

Q. Were things kept clean?—A. Kept just the same as they are now. The same thing continues.

Q. Did any witnesses tell you that anybody was induced to swear differently from what he knew?—A. O, yes, sir; several of them told me that.

Q. Do you remember who told you that?—A. Two or three patients. They have gone. One was named Dorsey, and William Brown, a nurse there. There were several of them.

Q. What means, did Mr. Brown say, were taken to make him make an affidavit contrary to what he wished?—A. Felton led the colored folks there to believe the doctors would be dismissed or should be dismissed, and if they did not testify against them he would make the Secretary of the Interior dismiss them from the hospital.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Do you say you are a watchman at the hospital now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On the day-watch or the night-watch?—A. The forepart of the night and the forepart of the morning, during breakfast and supper time, three or four hours at breakfast and three or four hours at night.

Q. What are your duties as watchman?—A. To see that everything is quiet and keep the gate, in order to see about people coming in.

Q. You spoke about Potter being out till eight o'clock at night. Do you keep a run of the patients who go out and in?—A. Yes, sir; we do not suffer sick patients to go out, but such men as Potter and those like him go out early in the evening, five or six o'clock, and return about eight.

Q. Do your rules require that they shall be all in at eight, or what is the hour?—A. They are all required to be in at nine.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Your statement is that Potter is not a very sick man?—A. Not as far as I can see. He travels about and seems as well and healthy as anybody about there; he seems to have a great deal of business, always going in and out.

WILLIAM BROWN (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. The committee are informed that you have a statement that you desire to make to us. You can make any statement that you see fit.—A. Well, the statement I want to make is concerning the commencement of the present affair. At the commencement there was a great deal of excitement around; they commenced talking to different ones, and before they had the investigation, before a man went and testified, the men talked with them, and they went before the committee when they met there.

Q. I do not understand you exactly.—A. I say that when they first commenced there a good many of them went before the committee and testified. Of course they had been talked to about going up and testifying.

Q. Talked to by whom?—A. Mr. Felton talked with them.

Q. Was that in your presence?—A. No; the men told me that they wanted me to go and testify; I told them that I did not care about coming here and testifying, because I did not know anything much about the law business, as I was there, and then I did not see anything wrong.

Q. Did you testify that there was anything wrong?—A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. They wanted you to testify against the management, and you said you did not know anything against it?—A. No; I did not know anything against the doctors.

Q. You did not testify against them?—A. I testified to what things I had seen, but then I did not see anything wrong.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. What do you mean by saying "they"? Who are they?—A. Testify that things were wrong in management around the hospital.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Who spoke to you about it?—A. Mr. Felton was one. He told me he wanted me to testify before the committee. The investigation committee was up there.

Q. Did he leave it to you to state what things you had seen or did he tell you what you had seen?—A. Well, he had something written off about what went on there, and told me to speak these things because I had seen them.

Q. Had you seen them?—A. I have never seen half the things wrong that they said were contrary there.

Q. You had not seen the things that he stated in the paper?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you declined to do so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Mr. Felton satisfied with you declining?—A. Well, he must be satisfied, because I must go there before the committee. Everything that I thought was not right, I made objection to.

Q. Is there anything further you wanted to say?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you yourself say anything to any one about Mr. Felton swearing at you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom did you say that?—A. I spoke to Mr. Roby, the watchman, and then I spoke to some one else about it.

Q. Did Mr. Felton swear at you to get you to make an affidavit, or for any other reason? What did he swear at you about?—A. All there that did not talk with them and consult with them they said were spies, and several times they were cursing and I spoke to them about cursing in the ward there.

Q. You made an affidavit, did you not, that Dr. Purvis induced you to make a former affidavit?—A. Dr. Purvis spoke to me one day, and said he wanted me to give in evidence because I was there and saw all these things. I did not like to do so, because I was uneasy and did not know what it would come to. I told him I would see about it, but he did not persuade me to make an affidavit.

Q. Any affidavit you made you made of your own free will?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. Felton spoke to me about making an affidavit, and I told him no, I did not want to make an affidavit. He said yes. But the affidavit the doctor spoke to me about he did not persuade me to make.

Q. Do I understand you that Felton swore at you because you would not say that Dr. Purvis persuaded you to do it?—A. He was always swearing. Sometimes when I was making up fires there in the building he would get to cursing anybody he would see going round about. He would curse them and abuse them, and it seemed as if he wanted everything very nice and correct around him. Any one who did not talk with them and talk the way they wanted him to talk, they would say he was a spy.

Q. Did you say to Mr. Roby that Felton made you say that Dr. Purvis induced you to make the affidavit which you did make, and swore at you to make you do it?—A. Mr. Felton told me that I must make an affidavit; I told him no, and he said yes, I must make an affidavit, because he was counsel for the case and I must make one.

Q. Did you do it?—A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Making you say "yes" where you had said "no"?—A. Yes, sir; but everything was upside down there. Everybody almost around the building was scared and did not know whether they would be discharged or not.

Q. Who were you afraid would discharge you?—A. I did not know whether they would go to headquarters and have us discharged. They were always writing letters.

Q. What do you mean by "headquarters;" the Interior Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say he was always writing there, and you were afraid he might get you discharged, and so you made the affidavit he wanted you to make?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I think it is stated in that affidavit that Dr. Purvis made you make an untruthful affidavit; is that true?—A. No, sir; it is not. Dr. Purvis

did not make me. He only spoke to me about it twice, and I told him "no" one time, and he came to me and said he would like for me to make an affidavit, because I was there and had seen everything and knew about everything.

Q. Did Dr. Purvis or Dr. Palmer ever threaten you with discharge if you testified or did not testify?—A. No, sir; they never said a word to me about that. All the threatening was on the other side, from Mr. Felton and them—all the threatening which was made there.

Q. Whom do you mean by "them" besides Felton?—A. Him and Bob Johnson and Mr. Potter were pretty much going through the building; all three of them worked together.

Q. And they are the ones you mean by "them"?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of those men threatening other persons there?—A. I do not know. I heard the other men say so.

Q. You did not see it yourself?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Why did you not tell us this the other day when you testified at the hospital before this committee?—A. Well, I answered all the questions which you asked me the other day at the hospital.

Q. How came you to come now to do it? We are very glad to have you come and tell the whole truth; but why do you come?—A. Well, I came myself, and the reason I came was this: The other day, when you asked me to make a statement, I was a little excited, and I knew there was something left out, and I thought I would come here and make a statement.

Q. Whom did you say so to?—A. I said so to Mr. Roby; he and I were talking.

Q. The doctors did not know about it?—A. No; the doctors did not say anything about it.

Q. The doctors did not ask you to come?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have come of your own free will?—A. Yes, sir.

SATURDAY, *March 2, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

ELIZA HEACOCK affirmed and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you live?—Answer. I am matron of the home for Destitute Women and Children, colored.

Q. Have you ever visited the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes.

Q. How often?—A. Frequently; I cannot say how often.

Q. For how long a time have you been in the habit of visiting it?—A. Ever since I have been in Washington as matron of this Home, since 1870; and before that, when I was here as a visitor occasionally.

Q. What can you say with reference to the condition of the Freedmen's Hospital for cleanliness during the last two or three years?—A. I have always found it clean.

Q. Did you visit the wards and go about in it?—A. Yes; the different wards I have gone through.

Q. Did there seem to be any uniformity in the cleanliness, or was it clean sometimes and not at others?—A. I have never found it dirty, but always clean.

Q. Did the beds seem to be in good order and the floors clean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever had occasion to examine the quality of the food of the hospital?—A. We had food supplied our home from there. It was always good.

Q. What was the food that was sent to your home? What were the articles?—A. Meat, bread, milk, sugar, pepper, cinnamon, ginger, crackers, cheese, and butter; I do not remember the other things that were sent.

Q. Was the Colored Orphans' Home at one time under the same roof with the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. No, we have never been under the same roof, but we first received support from the Freedman's Bureau, and then afterward a certain portion of our children received food from the hospital. We are about three or four squares from the hospital.

Q. How long have you been furnished food by the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Ever since the bureau was started; a part of the year before from the War Department.

Q. Was the meat that you obtained from the hospital cooked or uncooked?—A. Uncooked.

Q. What were the articles; for instance, what kind of meat?—A. Sometimes mutton, at other times beef and pork.

Q. In what kind of pieces would you get meat?—A. Good pieces; sometimes pieces to roast; always certain pieces for stewing, but good meat, suitable for the children to eat and for the ladies.

Q. Did you ever get any fish?—A. Yes, sir; salt fish, codfish and mackerel.

Q. What was the character of the mackerel?—A. Always good, and the codfish was good.

Q. Would you get bread or flour?—A. Both; some flour and a certain number of loaves of bread every day.

Q. Was the bread sweet or sour?—A. Sweet; we never had any sour bread from the hospital.

Q. Are you still furnished with bread from the hospital?—A. No; it stopped the first of July.

Q. Did all the supplies cease at that time?—A. All the supplies ceased. The last year we only had bread and milk from the hospital.

Q. About how much bread would you get, per day, from the hospital?—A. Eighty loaves.

Q. And how much flour did you get?—A. We have not had flour for the last two years; before that I asked for a barrel when we needed it, I think once a month; I do not remember, exactly, how long it lasted us.

Q. You found all the articles of food that you received from the hospital good?—A. Yes, sir.

Dr. MARY A. PARSONS sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession or business?—Answer. I am a physician.

Q. Where do you live?—A. I live in Washington.

Q. Have you ever had occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital during the last four years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever pass through the wards?—A. I used to be in the wards daily while I was a student at the college.

Q. How long ago was that?—A. I graduated in 1873, but I have visited there frequently since that time.

Q. What have you observed about the wards as to their cleanliness?—A. They have always been remarkably clean, considering the class of patients admitted.

Q. Do the beds seem to be in good order or bad order?—A. Always in good order.

Q. How was it so far as vermin were concerned, apparently?—A. The nurses seem to be very careful in regard to that. Of course there was more or less there.

Q. Do you consider that there were more there than unavoidable, considering the class of patients and the kind of buildings?—A. No, sir; they are not as noticeable as I have seen them in other institutions.

Q. What do you know about the food of the institution; have you ever had occasion to observe it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you observe about it?—A. It always seemed good in quality and fairly cooked.

Q. Have you noticed about the meats particularly, or the bread?—A. Yes, sir; I have seen the meats. I never tasted anything there until about two years ago, and since then I have eaten things there two or three times, and they were always very good.

Q. In your visits to the hospital, did you hear any complaints of patients that they did not receive food enough?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were you ever there at meal-times?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did they seem to have enough?—A. Yes, sir. I have heard complaints from patients about having too much food, and it not having been served well; but that was years ago.

Q. How long ago?—A. In 1872 and 1873; but it was only from discontented patients; it was not a general complaint.

Q. Have you observed about the treatment of the patients by the doctors, whether it was kind or attentive, or otherwise?—A. Uniformly kind.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. I should like to direct your attention to last summer. Complaints are made to us that last summer the treatment was not good, and the food was not good; and I wish simply to direct your attention to that time—say take June, July, and August, if you were there last summer?—A. I was not only in the wards at that time last summer, but I was also in the cook-room; that was the time to which I refer when I had eaten some of the food there.

Q. Does the testimony that you have given relate to these very months that I now speak of?—A. Yes, sir; the only time I ever had occasion to go into the cook-room at all.

Q. Be kind enough to tell me why you did then; was it because of complaints?—A. No, sir; a woman who is now assistant cook there had been for several years one of my patients, and I went there several times to see her, and went into the cook-room where she was at work.

Q. So that you had heard no complaint and did not go there for the purpose of examination?—A. No, sir.

Q. But did examine when there?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. And tasted the food?—A. Yes, sir; I tasted the food several times.

Dr. MARY D. SPACKMAN sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession or business?—Answer. Physician.

Q. Are you in practice?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where do you reside?—A. 1634 Sixteenth street.

Q. Have you ever had occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—
A. Frequently.

Q. For how long a time have you been in the habit of visiting it frequently?—A. Since 1870.

Q. Did you visit it last summer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Before that and since?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What have you observed in reference to the cleanliness of the hospital?—A. I have always found it very clean and neat.

Q. Did you find it so last summer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you observe with regard to the food of the patients? Did you ever have occasion to examine it?—A. Yes, sir; I have always thought it good.

Q. Have you frequently examined it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen it served in the wards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in the mess-room?—A. In the mess room lately; but I have seen it in the wards frequently.

Q. How lately in the mess-room?—A. Within a few days.

Q. Your testimony in reference to the wards, then, runs during the whole time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as to the other, only recently?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you noticed whether eggs were given to patients during your visits to the wards?—A. I do not remember particularly. I know that they have egg-nog and milk-punch when they need it. I do not remember particularly; but I think they have eggs; I am pretty sure that I have seen eggs.

Q. How was it formerly, or do you not remember?—A. The diet is the same. I do not know that I remember any particular change.

Q. You think the diet is the same now it always has been?—A. Yes, sir; I have noticed no change.

Q. Do you find any difference in the cleanliness of the hospital from what it was last June, July, and August?—A. None whatever.

Q. What have you observed with reference to the treatment of the patients by the doctors?—A. They have always been very kindly treated.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Is your practice a general or a hospital practice?—A. General practice.

Q. May I ask you the occasion that took you to the hospital last summer. Confine yourself, if you please, to the months of June, July, and August. Why did you go there?—A. I am a graduate of that college, and I have always been deeply interested, and would go there frequently. I had no particular purpose in going last summer different from my going at any time. I go out very often.

Q. Had you heard complaints at that time?—A. None at all.

Q. So that your attention was not directed to the hospital because of any complaints?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you as a physician see any cause for complaint? Did you see anything that would warrant complaint in your judgment?—A. Never.

Q. How often were you there probably. I suppose of course you cannot tell exactly.—A. I cannot remember. I would go out frequently.

Q. Take these summer months.—A. I can hardly tell. I would go out there often.

Q. During the months of June, July, and August?—A. At all times.

I do not remember those months particularly, for I have no particular reason for remembering them any more than other months.

Q. Did you know there had been an investigation heretofore, caused by the action of the Interior Department? Were you aware that there had been an investigation?—A. When do you mean?

Q. I mean what is called the last investigation, some months ago.—A. I knew there was an investigation.

Q. Did you know that during that investigation witnesses swore that they had been ill-treated and badly served during the last summer months of June, July, and August?—A. I have not heard those months specified.

Q. I directed your attention to them, supposing that in the day and time of it your mind might have gone back so that you could identify what the condition of the hospital was on those particular occasions.—A. I have never noticed any change.

Q. It is no more cleanly now than it was last summer?—A. No, sir; I am sure of it.

Rev. FELIX BARROTTI sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am a Roman Catholic priest attending the colored people of the city of Washington, and the chaplain to the Home of the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the Children's Home in the northern part of the city.

Q. Where is your residence?—A. Eleven hundred and nineteen Fifteenth street.

Q. Have you visited the Freedmen's Hospital very often?—A. I have been attending the Freedmen's Hospital as a Catholic clergyman since 1857, the first of September.

Q. How often have you visited the hospital?—A. As a priest I have attended sometimes two or three times a week, and then again it would be a month before I was called. It all depended on circumstances. I only had charge of the Catholic portion, and of course whenever there was any one needing my service the doctors were always kind enough to send for me. So whenever they needed my services I was there, sometimes two or three times a week, and I generally went there every fifteen days.

Q. What can you say with reference to the general cleanliness of the hospital during the time you have known it?—A. Do you extend this time to the whole ten years, or do you divide it?

Q. Begin and tell it as you have seen it from time to time.—A. As far as the general cleanliness is concerned, I always saw it clean and regularly clean. Inasmuch as I knew the very days that the hospital was to be cleaned and scrubbed and all that, I would not go on those particular days. The only complaint about cleanliness, as I suppose I am to tell the whole truth—

Q. Certainly.—A. It was only that about nine years ago, or something like that, there was a little smoking in the rooms, which, especially in the winter, I thought disagreeable to the patients; but of late I have not perceived it. There was a smoking in the rooms, and of course, especially in the winter, the windows not being open, I thought it was disagreeable.

Q. Do you mean the smoking of the stoves?—A. No; the smoking of pipes by the patients.

Q. How long ago was that broken up?—A. I have not perceived it for two or three years past that I know of.

Q. Were you there last summer during June, July, August, and September?—A. I could scarcely say what times I was there, because I have no memorandum of it, but I have been there generally, either I or my assistant, regularly. There has not been a month that we did not go.

Q. Did you find the condition of the hospital during those months as you have now represented it?—A. I have always found it clean as far as I have seen it.

Q. You have been there during the last month or two?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find any difference in the condition of the hospital?—A. I find no difference, only that I find a different order at the door, that I was not admitted in on account of not being known by the person that was at the door; I was told that he had orders to let no one in unless he knew who he was. That was the only difference.

Q. You found some impediment in getting in, but you got in?—A. I got in.

Q. Otherwise you found it all the same?—A. All the same. I have been through it all.

Q. Do you encourage patients who are of your faith to talk freely with you about the hospital, and allow them to do so if they wish to make complaints?—A. Always. I have advised a good many to go there. I have advised others not. I have sometimes advised persons to go rather to that hospital than to others, for the reason that I always saw everything was proper there as far as I could see, and at the same time I had free access there. I could always go to attend to them, and I had no reason to believe that they would not be well received and have all the attention from the doctors they needed. I advised many to go to that hospital rather than to others on that account.

Q. Have those whom you have visited professionally complained to you of their treatment there?—A. I never heard one single complaint of that. The only complaint was that they did not get tobacco enough. That is the only complaint I have ever heard, that they could not smoke enough. These are those who are not sick, the old people who came from the old Freedmen's Bureau.

Q. What class of patients are they generally; are they poor, indigent persons?—A. As far as I have sent persons there, I have known them all to be really poor persons that had either to go to the poor-house or the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. Have you ever noticed anything yourself about the food at the hospital?—A. I was there a great many times, especially in the morning, the time we go as Catholics to give communion to our people, and I have seen when they were taking their breakfast; of course they had to keep their breakfast from the people until I arrived there. I am not much of an expert in food, but I never knew of anything that was not proper or was not good, wholesome food. I never saw anything else. Then I have been there a good many times, especially in the evenings, in summer; generally I go in the afternoon in the summer time, and I never have seen anything that was not wholesome; but I was not there very often at those times.

Q. You were there during the summer time to which I have alluded. Did you notice that the food was the same as at other times?—A. I never noticed that the food was different. I cannot say about those months particularly, but I know that there was scarcely a month that I was not there, either myself or my assistant, and I never observed anything.

Q. As far as you have observed, it has been uniformly good from the present back?—A. Yes, at the times I was there.

WILLIAM SYPHAX (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. On P street northwest.

Q. Have you been a frequent visitor at the Freedmen's Hospital?—
A. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long a time?—A. Several years. I suppose I have been a visitor to the Freedmen's Hospital for eight or nine years, off and on.

Q. What is the object of your visits there—in connection with the institution?—A. No, sir. I am a member of the Baptist Church, and a great many of the inmates there are our old members, especially from Arlington, which was my former home. There are several there, and have been there, who were my friends in my childhood, and being members of our church, I have thought it my duty to visit them.

Q. What has been your observation of the condition of the hospital as to cleanliness?—A. So far as I have seen, it has been perfectly clean and neat.

Q. Were you there last summer?—A. I do not think I was there in the summer. I was there last spring.

Q. What month?—A. I think it was April or May. There was an old woman that died shortly after whom I went to see, and I did not go again for some time. I was there in the fall. I do not think I was there in the summer.

Q. How did the condition of the hospital in the spring and in the fall agree?—A. It looked very neat and clean. I was in two of the wards, both upstairs and down. Once I went upstairs. They looked very neat and clean. I conversed with my friends very freely, sat by the bedside, and talked with them very freely; everything looked neat and genteel, as far as I could observe.

Q. Did they make any complaints of their treatment?—A. Not the least.

Q. Did you question them as to their treatment there?—A. I did. I felt it my duty, as they were friends, to explain to them their rights, and I also told them that I thought it was the wish of the friends of the institution who had created it that they should be protected, and I asked them how they fared and how they were treated, and in all cases they expressed themselves to me that they were treated very kindly; after they left there, once or twice I would meet them and ask them how they had been treated, and how they got along, whether they received kind words, and so forth, and they always, as far as they talked to me, expressed themselves perfectly satisfied.

Q. Did you ever see any of the food served up to them?—A. I was there once, at dinner-time, I think.

Q. When was that?—A. I think it was early last spring. It was when Mr. Anderson was there, the former janitor of our school. I went to visit him. I happened there when the meal was brought in. I did not notice particularly what it was, but it was handed around by the man, and I asked one of them, "Suppose you have not enough, can you get any more?" "Certainly we can," was his answer to me, and I felt it my duty as a friend to tell them that of course persons who were placed there by the government could not expect to fare as they would at the Arlington Hotel or at Wormley's, but still I told them what was their right, and they seemed to be perfectly satisfied. In fact, one old woman told me that she even had dessert, and I carried her some tobacco, because I knew she smoked and had been doing it for a number

of years, and she told me they furnished her tobacco there. It has been my habit generally to carry tobacco to those who smoked.

Q. Did you notice whether the wards were clean or not?—A. Yes, sir; so far as I saw, the two wards that I went into.

Q. Have you been there during the last three months?—A. Yes, sir; I think I was there week before last. I visited two old women there week before last.

Q. Did you notice whether or not the wards were cleaner two or three weeks ago than they were last spring?—A. No, sir; I did not see any difference. It so happened the last time I was there that I went both upstairs and down, because there was an old woman there from Arlington that I went to see who was upstairs. It was Friday before last I was there.

Q. What have you noticed, if anything, with regard to the treatment of patients by the doctors, aside from what the patients told you?—A. The only treatment I saw of the doctors was that of brother Anderson, the former janitor of our school. I went to the secretary and got him put in there. He asked me if I would come out and visit him. His leg was taken off. He made a request of the doctor that I should be sent up to accompany him over to the house where his leg was taken off. I stood by while the three doctors, two other doctors besides Dr. Palmer, whose names I do not know, took his leg off in my presence. After it was all over, they carried him over to his other bed where they had taken him from. I waited, I suppose, fifteen minutes until he came to, and he did not know anything about it. I made him recognize me. He did not know anything at all about it. In a few days afterward, I went to see him again.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. He missed his leg, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir; his leg was gone. I told him about it, and asked him if it hurt him, and he said he did not know anything about it.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did it seem to have been done skillfully?—A. I never seen a leg taken off before, and I was there simply at his request. They carried him over very carefully on a lounge, and, after they placed him upon the table, there were some eight or ten students around, and these three doctors performed the operation. One of them put something to his nose, and gave him, I think, a little whisky to drink. Shortly after that he fell asleep as if dead, and, I think, in about twenty minutes, I do not think it was much more, his leg was taken entirely off, and they sewed it up. He came a little to, but did not recognize me until I went over to the building with him.

Q. Is he alive now?—A. No, sir; he is dead.

Q. When did he die?—A. I think he died last spring. He got better; I went to see him several times and sat by him; other brothers went to see him and he got better, and finally came, to my surprise, to my house to see me. He came to me to ask me would I try to look out and get him something to do, that he was nearly well, and his leg was entirely well. I was so surprised to hear of the man walking from Howard University to my house that I could hardly believe it. I told him I would try; but it was pretty cold weather, and shortly after that he was taken sick with a cold, with pneumonia.

Q. He died of something beside his leg?—A. Yes, sir; he died of pneumonia.

GEORGE DOLLEY (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Where do you reside ?—A. 1339 K street northwest.

Q. Do you ever visit the Freedmen's Hospital ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What takes you there ?—A. I have an aged mother there.

Q. How long has she been there ?—A. Since 1875.

Q. How often have you visited her there ?—A. Every week from that time to the present, except six weeks ; during which time I was away from Washington at the Centennial Exhibition.

Q. Would you go at the same time of day every week, or different times of day ?—A. Different times of day.

Q. What have you seen about the condition of the hospital during the two years you have been going there every week ?—A. I have visited but one ward, and I have always found that cleanly, in perfect condition, so far as sanitary rules go.

Q. How has your mother been treated there ?—A. Very kindly, I presume. She always seems to be happy ; much more so than I could have expected away from friends. She has kept a genteel appearance ; looks comfortable ; her bed is clean, and everything, as well as I can see, is nice.

Q. Is she there from age or from sickness ?—A. From age.

Q. Do you know where she eats ?—A. Yes, sir ; in the ward.

Q. Does she ever complain to you of her food ?—A. Never.

Q. Have you ever seen the food that was given to her ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the character of it ?—A. Nice, remarkably so ; well cooked and very nice. I at one time tasted the soup to test the flavor of it, and it was very nice. They happened to have oyster soup that day, and I thought I would taste it and see the flavor.

Q. Did you ever see the meat given to her ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it wholesome meat ?—A. It appeared to be good.

Q. And the bread ; how is that ?—A. Bread very good ; baker's bread.

Q. Did you ever notice the hominy ?—A. I do not remember as to vegetables ; I remember seeing tomatoes there once or twice ; I have not been there very often during the meal hours.

Q. Did you visit her during last summer, during June, July, and August ?—A. I did.

Q. Did she make any complaint to you then ?—A. She never has made any complaint since she has been there.

Q. And you have been visiting her at the hospital ever since ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you see any difference between the cleanliness of the hospital now and what it was last summer ?—A. I cannot observe any change ; it was as nice in the beginning as before. I visited the hospital the day before she was carried there in 1875, along with Dr. Johnston, now dead ; and we found it in perfect condition then, and it has been, so far as I have seen, ever since.

Dr. R. S. WALSH (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT.

Question. What is your business ?—Answer. Practicing physician.

Q. Where do you reside ?—A. 1008 Nineteenth street northwest.

Q. Were you formerly a student at the Howard University ?—A. I was.

Q. You are not now and have not been for several years?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any connection with the hospital in any way?—A. As lecturer.

Q. You mean lecturer at the University?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. No connection with the hospital?—A. None at all.

Q. Do you draw any revenue from the hospital in any way?—A. None.

Q. Have you been accustomed to visit the hospital during the last three years?—A. I have.

Q. Just state what you have observed there with reference to cleanliness, food, and treatment of patients.—A. I entered the college in the latter part of 1870, and continued there until March, 1872. I visited frequently by virtue of having sent patients there. On my visits I always found the hospital in good condition. I never saw cause of complaint, nor heard complaint.

Q. To what period are you now referring?—A. 1870 to 1872 and subsequently.

Q. Go on.—A. I have never heard complaint from any of the patients, nor never observed anything that would lead me to suppose that the hospital was not conducted properly.

Q. Did you ever notice anything about the food of the patients?—A. I have frequently.

Q. Did you observe it last summer?—A. I did.

Q. During what months?—A. I cannot call to mind the months, but I visited it, as I stated, frequently to see the patients there; I cannot tell about what exact months.

Q. Did the patients complain of their treatment in any way?—A. Never to me.

Q. Did you give them an opportunity to do so if there was any trouble with their food, or anything else?—A. I have often asked questions in reference to their treatment, and their answers were generally uniform kindness and attention.

Q. You observed yourself that the wards were clean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you observed anything about the treatment by the doctors of the patients in the hospital?—A. Their treatment was kind and attentive.

Q. Have you visited the hospital within the last few weeks?—A. I have.

Q. Is there any difference in its cleanliness, or food, or in any other particular that you have noticed?—A. I cannot answer in regard to the food, but in regard to cleanliness there is no difference.

JAMES F. SHOBER (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. At present I am residing at the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. What is your business there?—A. I work in the dispensary.

Q. How long have you been connected with the dispensary?—A. Since September last.

Q. Were you familiar with the hospital before that time?—A. Yes, sir; I have been connected with the hospital more or less since October, 1876.

Q. In what capacity were you connected with it before September last?—A. Before that I was janitor.

Q. What has been your observation of the treatment of patients at the hospital?—A. It has been very good.

Q. In what condition has the hospital been kept?—A. It has been very clean, as far as I have been able to observe, and I have had frequent opportunity to do that, because I have gone around frequently, being within the inclosure all the time.

Q. Did you ever notice the food that was given to patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you notice it last summer?—A. I was not present last summer. I was absent from June until about the middle of September.

Q. You observed it before June?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it of the same general character that it is at present, or was it different?—A. I have not seen any difference.

Q. Have you the same cooks?—A. Yes, sir; except that there is an assistant cook, Miss Powell, who was not there before that.

Q. What time did she come?—A. I do not remember; some time last fall.

Q. At the time you were there, before last summer, in going around about the wards, or the hospital, did the patients ever complain to you in any instance?—A. No, sir; from last March, I think, about the latter part of March up to the time I went away in the summer, I went around with Dr. Purvis, did his writing, and I did not bear any complaint the whole time I was with him.

Q. No complaint was made either to you or to him?—A. No, sir; I heard none made to him. I have often heard the patients ask him for extra diet, and I have for the first time to know of his refusal.

Q. He would always comply?—A. Yes, sir; he always complied; changed it or gave whatever was wanted.

Q. What was his manner with the patients, kind or harsh?—A. Very cheerful. He tried to make everything as pleasant as possible for them.

S. F. STAGG recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I am stopping at the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. Are you connected with it in any way?—A. I am a resident student of the medical college branch of the Howard University.

Q. Have you any connection with the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I go around every day with the physician, Dr. Purvis.

Q. You simply go around the hospital in pursuit of knowledge in your proposed profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you draw any revenue at all from the hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. How long have you been accustomed to go about the hospital?—A. About two months.

Q. Had you visited it before that time?—A. I used to do so occasionally last winter a year ago.

Q. What have you observed during the last two months in reference to the hospital?—A. As far as cleanliness is concerned, it was always clean.

Q. What have you observed about the food?—A. All I have noticed was good.

Q. Were any complaints made to the doctor in your presence?—A. I never have heard any.

Q. How was it last winter?—A. As regards cleanliness, I do not see any difference.

Q. In any other respect?—A. I do not perceive any change.

Q. The hospital is now conducted in the same manner it was then?

A. Yes, sir; as far as I know.

Q. Is the hospital kept clean and decent?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the character of the patients that are brought there?—

A. They are generally a poor class.

Dr. DORSEY N. MCPHERSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your business or profession?—Answer. I am a practicing physician.

Q. Where do you reside?—A. Corner of Second and A streets, south-east.

Q. Do you ever have occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; I was a resident student there in the spring and fall of 1876.

Q. Have you visited the hospital since?—A. I have.

Q. How often?—A. About once a week since September.

Q. What have you found as to the condition of the hospital since September, so far as cleanliness is concerned?—A. Always clean; no difference.

Q. What have you observed since September with regard to the food of the patients; have you ever seen it?—A. But once or twice. I could see no difference whatever.

Q. How does the present condition of the hospital, or the condition it has been in since last September, compare with what it was when you were a resident student at the university?—A. I can see no difference whatever.

Q. At the former time was it kept in decent order and cleanliness?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That you noticed, did you?—A. Yes, sir.

Dr. ROBERT REYBURN sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. Physician.

Q. Where do you reside?—A. 2129 F street.

Q. Were you at any time in charge of the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; I built it.

Q. Between what years?—A. From its organization and building in 1866 until March, 1875.

Q. By whom were you succeeded?—A. By Dr. Palmer.

Q. Did you obtain meat from Mr. Hoover?—A. I did.

Q. The one that now furnishes the hospital?—A. I suppose the same man.

Q. What was the character of the meat Mr. Hoover used to furnish the hospital?—A. Very good. I always considered him a very fair and honorable man, and do so still.

Q. What kind of pieces of meat did he furnish?—A. We got whole quarters. We used large quantities, and would get the whole quarter at one time—several of them, in fact.

Q. Do you know the present nurses at the hospital? Do you know who they are?—A. Yes, sir; almost all of them.

Q. Are they the same nurses that you kept?—A. I know a great many are; but I have never been in the institution since I left, and of course I only know that from hearsay; but I know a great many of them are there—a majority of them—I think almost all of them.

Q. Were they accustomed, in your time, to keep the wards clean?—
A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were they faithful nurses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know whether the cooks who are there now were those under you?—A. I cannot say of my own knowledge.

Q. It has been testified here that the cooks are the same, except one that came last June. Were those cooks that you had skillful, careful cooks; did they cook food well or otherwise?—A. Yes; they of course were rough cooks. We never pretended in an institution of that kind to make such a table as you would at a hotel; but the food was well cooked, and we endeavored to have it always inspected every day by each medical officer in turn.

Q. The cooks were competent to roast or boil beef or cook hominy properly?—A. Yes, sir; certainly.

Q. Considering the kind of patients you had, the kind of diseases they had, &c., did you ever have difficulty about having your water-closets kept clean?—A. Yes, sir; a great deal. You must remember that many of the patients who came in were entirely ignorant of sanitary rules; and that was one of our great troubles and difficulties with them; we had a great deal of difficulty in that way.

Q. With all your vigilance and care, bad consequences could not be prevented in that respect?—A. Not always. We made daily inspections; but still it was very difficult. Allow me to make one statement which will explain perhaps the reason why supplies were furnished to the orphan asylum. It is a matter of Congressional enactment. The asylum matron, Miss Heacock, did not state that.

Q. You can state it.—A. The reason supplies were always furnished by the Freedmen's Hospital to the orphan asylum was that by Congressional enactment that was made part of the institution. Although a separate institution, you will find by the language of the appropriation it read for some years, "Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum," especially to include the supplies furnished that orphan asylum.

Q. What supplies were you accustomed to furnish the asylum?—A. Bread, meat, crackers, cheese, butter; in fact, we generally furnished to the amount of their proportion. We gave them their quota of the appropriation, and they drew the articles they wished out of that. We gave them a little latitude. We furnished milk, also, and staple articles.

Q. Who were the inmates of that asylum that you used to furnish these articles for?—A. Orphan children and some old women. There were seventy children, I think, at the time I was in charge.

Q. Why were they not kept under the same roof as the hospital?—A. In the first place, this institution was a separate organization, and was acting under a charter given by Congress, and when the hospital was built there was not room for them. I might explain the way the hospital came to be built. When the Freedman's Bureau was closed there was a number of patients left in charge of the government, and it was necessary to provide a place for them. Some had to be brought from Richmond. The authorities of Richmond refused to take charge of them, and they had either to be turned into the street or brought here. Some, also, from Nashville, were brought here. There was not room at that time to take in this class.

Q. Did you have under your charge in the hospital idiots and persons suffering from mild dementia?—A. Yes, sir; a number of them came from Richmond. We had to take them; we could not turn them into the street.

Q. Was there any other institution to which they could be sent?—A.

No, sir. I would explain that when the Freedman's Bureau closed there were a number of hospitals under it in the Southern States. I was at that time chief medical officer of the bureau. We succeeded in turning over a great many of these hospitals to the States and State institutions. They took them with the furniture and all the appliances, to take care of the patients. But in some States we could not do that. The case at Richmond was a case in point. They refused absolutely to take charge of the patients, and we had to bring them here, and among them were a number of these imbecile and idiotic persons. If a man became dangerous we would try to send him over to Saint Elizabeth if we could not keep him with the other persons.

Q. That is the insane asylum?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was a legacy left on our hands by the war?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The breaking up of the contraband camps?—A. Yes, sir; I was on duty in the bureau from the organization to the ending.

ALBERT G. WALL (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I am residing on G. S. Kimball's farm, across the navy-yard bridge. I do not know just exactly how to locate it, as I have been there but a very few days at present. I moved there a few days ago.

Q. Where did you live before that?—A. On the corner of Fourth street and Pomeroy street. Some call it Four and a half street, and others Fourth street.

Q. Is that beyond the boundary?—A. Beyond the boundary, near the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a dairyman at present.

Q. Do you furnish milk for the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you done that?—A. I have been furnishing milk for about a year and upwards; in the neighborhood of a year.

Q. What do you get for your milk?—A. I am getting during the winter season thirty-five cents per gallon, and in the summer thirty cents; that was what I got last summer.

Q. Is that a low price for milk, or a fair price?—A. That is a pretty fair price for good milk. It would be a pretty stiff price for bad milk. For good milk I would claim that it is a fair, reasonable price. A man can make a living at it.

Q. Is that the price you furnish it to other customers?—A. I have some private customers I furnish at forty cents a gallon or five cents a pint, ten cents a quart. Some I am furnishing at thirty-five cents a gallon.

Q. That is as low as you furnish it to any of your customers?—A. Yes, sir; as low as I furnish any.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Do you furnish them all the same milk?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you know anything about the condition of the hospital during the past two years. Have you ever gone through it much?—A. I have visited the hospital daily for the last two years.

Q. What parts of it?—A. In fact all parts of it, all the wards. I have frequented all the wards with the physicians at different times, and I have always found the wards in a cleanly condition; have always found the food very cleanly and cooked in a palatable manner.

Q. Have you seen any improvement in that respect during the last two or three months?—A. I have not.

Q. Were you visiting the hospital last summer?—A. I was, daily.

Q. Did you find the condition of the hospital which you have described applicable then?—A. Yes, sir; just the same as it is at present.

Q. Were the patients complaining in your presence?—A. I never heard any complaint at all until since Mr. Felton has been there, and Mr. Johnson.

Q. Have you noticed Felton and Johnson there?—A. I have. I have had occasion to notice them, because I was there at one time as watchman of the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. Do you know O. S. B. Wall?—A. I have known him for thirty-four years now.

Q. Is he a relative of yours?—A. He is said to be a brother.

Q. Do you know Dr. Augusta?—A. I know him; I am personally acquainted with Dr. Augusta.

Q. Do you know Calvert, the engineer?—A. Yes, sir; I know him.

Q. Do you know Mr. Potter, a patient there?—A. O, yes; I am acquainted with him.

Q. Do you know Chase?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Adams?—A. I do not think I know Adams; I may possibly know him, but I cannot recall him.

Q. What do you know, if anything, of any arrangement or consultation among those men for an assault against the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Well, sir, I know that by Mr. Potter, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Felton, there was, from time to time, a caucus held in the room of one of the nurses, Mr. Brown, frequently; you might say every other night in the week.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Do you know this personally of your own knowledge?—A. I know this personally. I know they have often held caucuses there at such a late hour and kept so much noise—such loud, boisterous noise—by Mr. Felton speaking to his mob; and they caused so much noise on one or two occasions that I had to go and stop it. I had to tell him it was against the rules of the institution. On one occasion I could not get it stopped except by turning the lights down. I turned down the lights, and left him in a dark room, which I was reprimanded for.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. By whom were you reprimanded?—A. Dr. Palmer spoke to me about it. Dr. Palmer said I ought to have spoken to the nurse, and that would have been sufficient; that it was hardly my place to turn out the light; the nurse should have done that.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Did that turning down of the lights have the desired effect?—A. It did. I told him he must stop, he must abate the nuisance, he must stop making the noise. He was speaking in a very loud boisterous manner, and his comrades were enjoying it by hearty laughs, making considerable noise that caused the patients to be aroused and kept them restless until about eleven o'clock.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What was the object of that meeting? Could you hear what was said?—A. It was stated that Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Purvis, and in fact all surgeons who were in charge of the Freedmen's Hospital, should be

dismissed, and in the course of a little while they were getting the thing in a fair way to dispose of them, &c., and general conversation pertaining to the matter that they had on hand about that.

Q. When did you commence to furnish milk to the hospital?—A. I think, if I mistake not, it was about the beginning of 1867. I do not know just the month, but I did not furnish all the milk of the hospital at that time. I only furnished a couple of gallons.

Q. Who furnished the rest?—A. Capt. O. S. B. Wall, I believe.

Q. Do you know whether O. S. B. Wall had anything to do with this movement?—A. Well, sir, I know that they held meetings or were cousing in O. S. B. Wall's office. I saw present there Mr. Calvert, Mr. Chase, and Mr. Potter, from time to time.

Q. Was Dr. Augusta ever there?—A. Yes, sir; and Dr. Augusta. I saw him there quite often.

Q. Did either of the persons who met at Captain Wall's office endeavor to induce you to join in the effort to remove Dr. Palmer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was it?—A. Well, Capt. O. S. B. Wall, on two or three occasions, spoke to me about the matter.

Q. What inducement did he hold out to you?—A. He said it would be wise for me to keep my mouth shut in this matter; not to have anything to do with it; that Dr. Palmer was not paying prices to me for my milk, and that he would not do it. White men had always been furnishing milk there and being paid for it, but the moment a colored man got it he cut the price of milk down, he said; and that if I would have nothing to do with the matter at all, and say nothing on either side, if he should accomplish his purpose, which he was positive of doing, if he would put a man in that hospital whom he could control, I need not be afraid at all, that I would not be removed from my present place of furnishing milk to the Freedmen's Hospital. Instead of taking from me there would be added to me. I suppose he meant by that I would have more patronage from the institution; and a great many things I cannot just think of at present.

Q. Did you have any conversation with Robert T. Johnson about this matter?—A. Yes, sir; I had conversations with Robert Johnson about it.

Q. Did Johnson ever tell you anything about this matter, so far as it related to Purvis?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he say about that?—A. In what particular do you mean?

Q. Whether the investigation was *bona fide* or not, whether there was anything against Purvis or anybody else.—A. He intimated, in fact he said to me, that it was a got-up thing. I would like to speak it just as he spoke it to me.

Q. Exactly.—A. Says he, "Al, there isn't a nurse in this room," in other words "a nigger in this room that I can't influence in five minutes and make them turn and go just any way that I say;" and he said something to me concerning Secretary Schurz in the matter.

Q. What was it? Give the whole of it.—A. He said that Secretary Schurz had promised him that he should be supported in this thing, and for him to go ahead, and that anything he wanted in that institution let him know and he should have it; if there was any man there that was about to be turned out, if he did not want him turned out, to send word to him and he should not be turned out; and if any man was turned out and he wanted him reinstated he would reinstate him for him, and that he held daily correspondence with Secretary Schurz from day to day.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. This is what Johnson said?—A. Yes, sir; Robert T. Johnson.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. In that connection did he say that this was a put-up job?—A. I do not know that it was just at that time, but I had a great many talks with Johnson about this matter, because I felt that it was a put-up thing myself; in fact I knew it was, because there was no ground to do anything without it was a put-up thing; I knew that.

Q. Was Johnson trying to persuade you to join him, or you trying to persuade Johnson to drop it?—A. I was not trying to persuade him to drop it, but I was thinking he was going wrong, and I did not want to see him doing wrong. I did not want to see these charges brought up against men, and stain the character and reputation of men that had been working for their reputation so long as Dr. Palmer, Dr. Purvis, and others had; and to have their character stained and blotted by a miserable outcast like Robert T. Johnson I thought was ridiculous. I thought it behooved me as a man, and would behoove everybody else, to take hold of the matter, and I felt an interest in the matter, and I talked to him about it. I did it for the purpose of getting at the bottom of it. I wanted to get at the foundation to see if I could possibly find why it was that this thing was brought out. He intimated to me on one occasion that he needed money very bad, and that he would do now almost anything for money.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. He wanted money badly? Did he say anything about getting money from the surgeons in charge?—A. He did not mention any one's name, or any surgeon in charge, but he just brought up the question of money. I do not know how it came about.

Q. How was he going to get money?—A. He wanted some person to buy his stock, I guess.

Q. Stock in what?—A. His interest; he wanted to be bought out.

Q. His interest in the Interior Department or in the institution?—A. I guess his interest in the Interior Department.

Q. Some witness has said something here about some one saying that the thing could be stopped for a few hundred dollars. Was anything of that sort ever said to you?—A. It was not said directly to me, but I heard it the next day after it was mentioned.

Q. Did you hear it from him?—A. Mr. Roby was telling me.

Q. How long have you known Robert T. Johnson?—A. About seven years.

Q. What is his character?—A. It has always been very bad, as I consider it.

Q. Do you know him well; that is, have you seen him frequently?—A. I have frequented his place. I was once in the Treasury Department, and he kept a saloon and restaurant, and I took my lunch there at noon, and I got acquainted with him. I know on one occasion there were some stolen cigars found in his possession.

Q. You were not there when they were found?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then you need not speak of that. Is he a truthful man, so regarded, I mean, by people that associate with him, a man of truth and veracity, entitled to belief?—A. I never associated with him, and I do not know any person that ever has that spoke well of him.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Would you believe him yourself?—A. I think I would on oath; but, ordinarily speaking, I do not say that I would believe him.

Q. You say Johnson told you he was in daily correspondence with Secretary Schurz?—A. He told me so.

Q. Did he show you any letters he had written to him?—A. He did not show me any letters, but he pointed to a package of letters, and said "Those are all from him."

Q. All from whom?—A. Secretary Schurz.

Q. To him?—A. Yes, sir.

ARTHUR MAXWELL (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you live?—Answer. 2119 Eleventh street north-west.

Q. Have you ever been a patient in the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you there last July, August, and September?—A. Yes, sir; I was there July and August.

Q. How were you treated there?—A. I was treated very well.

Q. Did you ever see any bad bread there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever have any bad meat?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Bad hominy?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did you ever have any bad fish?—A. No, sir.

Q. How did they keep your ward, clean or otherwise?—A. Very clean and nice.

Q. What was the condition of your bed?—A. Very clean. Everything was kept very nice and clean while I was there.

Q. How did the doctors treat you?—A. They treated me very well.

Q. You are not in the hospital now?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have not been since last September?—A. No, sir.

FRANK CARROLL (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you live?—Answer. Georgetown, Bridge street, 187, between Market and Washington streets.

Q. Were you ever in the Freedmen's Hospital as a patient?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From what time, to what time?—A. I cannot remember exactly the time I went there. I was there from 1875 to 1877; April, 1877.

Q. You left there in April, 1877?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you quite sick?—A. Yes, sir; I was very low.

Q. What was your treatment?—A. I had very good treatment. I had everything I wanted, fresh meats, eggs, custards, rice, toast bread, tea, boiled milk.

Q. Did they treat you kindly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often did you have eggs?—A. Three times a day some days, and sometimes twice.

Q. Did you have special diet on account of your sickness?—A. Yes, sir; I was in a room to myself the best part of the time when I was very low.

Q. Did they cure you up?—A. O, yes, sir, they cured me up. Dr. Purvis was my doctor; he attended me very faithfully.

Q. Have you been in the hospital since April, 1877?—A. I was there last week one day.

Q. Did you see any difference in the condition of the hospital from what it was when you were there?—A. No, sir; I did not see any at all I was there this morning too, for some medicine.

Q. And the hospital was as clean when you were there before as it is now this week?—A. Yes, sir; it is kept very nice.

Q. And was then?—A. Yes, sir; I did not see any change at all.

Q. Did the patients ever complain of their food when you were there?—A. No, sir; I heard no complaint at all. After I was going about I ate in the mess-room, and I never heard any complaint there.

THURSDAY, *March 7, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

FRANKLIN E. FELTON recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. The committee have received the following letter from you:

WASHINGTON, *March 2, 1878.*

To the Senate Subcommittee to investigate the Freedmen's Hospital:

GENTLEMEN: I learn through the public press that at your last session Sister Beatrice Duffy, of Providence Hospital, made a fierce assault on myself, and, if her statements are correctly reported, she committed deliberate perjury in order to vilify me. Fair play and the commonest justice demand that I shall be afforded an immediate opportunity to appear before you and vindicate myself against the aspersions heaped upon me by feminine malice and mendacity. It is especially repugnant to my feelings to be involved in a controversy with a woman; but a female slanderer must not be vouchsafed immunity by reason of her sex, nor should ostentatious professions of religion and sanctity be permitted to serve as a cloak to sacrilegious hypocrisy, nor a white coronet and serge frock be sufficed, like charity, to "cover a multitude of sins."

Respectfully,

F. E. FELTON.

Answer. Yes, sir; I wrote that letter, and desire that it shall go on the record. I understand, gentlemen, through the public press, that Sister Beatrice Duffy, of Providence Hospital, at your last session, made statements that conflict with the testimony which I gave before this committee, which is God's truth. She has raised an issue of veracity between herself and me. I am ready to meet that issue, and I ask the privilege of relieving myself from any imputation in any way affecting my truthfulness. In order that there may be no misapprehension of my language, or any misconstruction of my statements, I have reduced my statement to writing, and I request to be allowed to submit it to the committee, and then I will cheerfully answer any questions the committee may propound to me.

Mr. EATON. That is not quite the position in which you stand. You ask now to testify to rebut certain charges that were made against you. The committee will hear you. We did not send for you.

The WITNESS. That is what I say. I ask permission to vindicate myself.

Mr. EATON. You are entitled to that; but why go further and say that we may ask you any questions we please? You go on and confine yourself, of course, to the points. As a lawyer you know very well what they are. You now desire to meet what you call charges that were made against you by another witness; therefore confine yourself to that.

The WITNESS. Very well. Then I wish to go further; I wish to say that I have very important information in regard to the management of the Freedmen's Hospital. As I understand, this is a committee to investigate the Freedmen's Hospital, and I desire, after I shall have made my statement in regard to this question of veracity, to give my testimony in regard to the management of the Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. SARGENT. We examined you at length upon that matter and asked you if you had any further statement to make, to which you replied that you had not.

The WITNESS. Very well; but matters have come to me since. I was examined unexpectedly. I did not know what questions you were to propound to me, and information has come to me since.

Mr. EATON. It would not have made any difference. If it has come to you since you could not have given us the information then.

The WITNESS. What I mean to say is, that I have reflected on the matter, and matters that I was not examined upon at that time I have thought over since, and still further questions which I was in doubt about at that time I have now resolved and can give you authentic information on the questions which you asked me then.

Q. (By Mr. SARGENT.) You can proceed first and make any statement in reply to Sister Beatrice Duffy's statement in regard to you.—A. I never received from Providence Hospital any remuneration for the loss of my valuable overcoat, which was stolen while in the custody of the institution, through the carelessness of the custodian of the room where the patients' clothing was deposited. I sued the hospital when refused a settlement of my loss, but the case was not brought to trial, as I was prostrated with chills and fever on the day fixed for the hearing. I shall give the matter my attention when able to attend to business. I could have submitted to my loss with equanimity and waived my right to reparation had I been treated with civility and fairness. On the 5th of May, 1877, Sister Beatrice Duffy notified me by letter that there was a room for me at Providence Hospital if I chose to return, which I declined to do for the reason, as I wrote her, that I was not satisfied with my treatment there.

Q. Have you a copy of her letter?—A. I will explain this. Her letter to me I intrusted to O. S. B. Wall, esq., when I consulted him about my claim against the hospital. I lately wrote to Mr. Wall to return her letter to me, and received from him the following communication:

MARCH 6, 1878.

DEAR SIR: I have received your note respecting me to return to you Sister Beatrice's letter to yourself, which you, at my request, delivered to me last May, when you consulted me about the loss of your overcoat while in the custody of Providence Hospital. Her letter was recently mislaid, lost, or destroyed, with other papers, on the occasion of the removal of said papers from my office while on fire. I think that in that letter Sister Beatrice notified you that you were at liberty to return to Providence Hospital, if you saw fit to do so, at any time, &c., &c.

Very respectfully,

O. S. B. WALL.

F. E. FELTON, Esq.

I left Providence Hospital on the 16th of April, 1877. On that very day I entered the Freedmen's Hospital. Before leaving the Providence Hospital I sought out Sister Beatrice. I met her in the corridor, on the lower floor, as she was bearing a pitcher of water. I told her that I would leave the hospital after breakfast, because I was dissatisfied with my treatment there. I meant by that that I could not get and did not get, while I was there, the services of a male nurse, which my case imperatively required.

Q. Were you in the male ward?—A. No, sir; I was in a private room.

Q. Attached to the male ward?—A. Attached? No, sir; separate, a private room. The male ward was a government-pauper ward. I was in a private room, and had to pay the rates charged to private patients, entirely separate and distinct.

Q. Were there any male attendants?—A. There was a male who waited on me to bring my meals, and that was all; and I will explain that. His name was Mr. Simon, the surgical nurse of the government ward and of the sailors' ward on the lower floor; but Mr. Simon never manipulated me, and never treated me as a nurse. On the contrary, his time was so fully occupied with the surgical cases in those two wards that he would have had no time to attend cases to me, and I never asked him.

Q. You say you paid your expenses there. Did you pay them yourself?—A. I did not say that.

Q. What did you say?—A. I did not say that. I said that I was charged the rates of private patients.

Q. Who paid the charges?—A. My brother.

Q. In Philadelphia?—A. Yes, sir. Shall I proceed?

Q. Certainly.—A. On leaving the Providence Hospital I the same day entered the Freedmen's Hospital. At that time I was so disabled in my limbs that I was unable to walk from the medical headquarters in the Howard medical building to ward 1, to which I was assigned, and by Dr. Palmer's order I was carried from the medical headquarters to the ward in a chair borne by two men—Nathan Street and Charles Banks. Dr. Palmer is here, I see, and can corroborate that.

It is absurd to suppose that a patient who was so infirm and disabled as I was should leave a hospital to go into an active business as Sister Beatrice absurdly alleges that I did. I had no intention whatever of going into business, because it would have been an utter impossibility in my case. I do not know, as I have not seen Sister Beatrice's testimony, what other allegations she has made concerning me.

Q. Sister Beatrice says you were a person of unsound mind, in her opinion.—A. I am very glad you have mentioned that. It is alleged by Sister Beatrice that I am of unsound mind. Such a statement, of course, is a facetious fiction, and shows Sister Beatrice to be a person of "infinite jest." Punch himself never perpetrated a better joke. I would be willing to be tried by you, gentlemen, as a commission *de lunatico inquirendo* to test the question of my sanity. I will say still further that this absurd, this malicious, this monstrous charge made by that female shows her *animus* toward me—shows her malignity—which will go so far as actually to impute insanity to a man of perfectly sound mind, and shows that she is utterly unworthy of attention or belief.

Q. She also states that you used profane language at times to the patients?—A. O, certainly I did. I admit it freely.

Q. And acted in a disagreeable manner with the patients?—A. That I never heard before. Let me refer to this matter about my using profane language, because that seems to have been dwelt upon by Palmer and Purvis and Glennan, and everybody else. Let me just explain that: when I am excited I use, like a great many men of the world, undoubtedly strong and sometimes profane language. It is a habit that I have fallen into, and I use such language unconsciously, without any intention of doing wrong, but simply to give emphasis to what I say. But Dr. Palmer himself, it can be proved, has cursed; Dr. Purvis, it can be proved, has also cursed.

Q. Did you know Dr. Purvis to speak of nurses in the hospital as black sons of bitches, or things of that kind?—A. I do not know that he did, but he has cursed.

Q. It is stated that you used that character of language?—A. I did to one who, I informed Dr. Palmer, was a thief. Undoubtedly I did, but only to one that I remember. I notified Dr. Palmer that that man was a thief; that I had the evidence that he was a thief, and I requested that he should be removed. Instead of that, Dr. Palmer ignored the matter, and never investigated it. The man is there in the hospital to-day; and last Monday night the hospital baggage-room was burglarized, was broken into at night. The clothing belonging to the patients, myself included, was stolen, to the amount of from \$150 to \$200. It was done by some person perfectly familiar with that room. It has been proved to our satisfaction that it was not done by any patient, but that it was done by some outside party that has been in the habit of having access to that room, and the detectives and all of us are satisfied that it was that assistant nurse that Dr. Palmer was informed was a dishonest man, and kept.

Q. What is the name of the nurse?—A. His name is Henry Sanders.

Q. You were inquiring what the statement of the sister was. She stated that when you first came to Providence Hospital you presented yourself there as destitute, having no money at all, but told her you had ample means, and in a few days could get them, if they would trust you; that they believed you as such, and took you in. You were very sick at the time, paralyzed. In a few days you gave a draft on San Francisco, on your brother. She states that she left this draft at the Bank of Washington, to have it collected. It was sent on, but was not acknowledged.—A. Her statement is, like all her other statements, false.

Q. You gave no such draft?—A. Allow me to explain. When I went to the Providence Hospital I was completely disabled. I was unable to walk. It is true that I was temporarily exhausted. I stated to Sister Beatrice that I had no money then, but that I would pay her for my week's board the next Wednesday. I entered on a Saturday. I immediately wrote to a friend of mine, who sent me the money, and I paid it on Wednesday, out of my own money. In the mean time I wrote to my brother, S. M. Felton, of Philadelphia, and he wrote to Sister Beatrice that he wished that I should have whatever I required, and he would pay all my bills; and he did so as long as I was in the hospital.

Q. Did you give a draft on San Francisco?—A. I will explain that. After I had been there some time, I thought that I would draw on my brother in San Francisco, Mr. John B. Felton, who is dead now, who had previously furnished me with money whenever I had drawn upon him. I drew the draft for my own convenience; I wanted the money for myself, and not to pay her my expenses at the hospital, for my brother, Mr. S. M. Felton, was going to pay them, as he notified me and Sister Beatrice, and did pay them.

Q. Why did you give the draft to Sister Beatrice, then?—A. I asked Sister Beatrice if she had a bank-account; that I wished to draw a draft on my brother in San Francisco, and I would like to have it deposited in bank. I was unable to go out and deposit it. I simply gave it to her to accommodate me by depositing it in bank, to send it out for collection. Neither she nor the Providence Hospital would have received a cent of that money had that draft been honored. My brother, Mr. S. M. Felton, was to pay all my bills, and did pay them, and sends me money now whenever I write for it.

Q. What kind of an overcoat was that you had?—A. It was a valu-

able overcoat. It was an overcoat that I purchased of Messrs. Wanamaker & Brown, in the city of Philadelphia, at the corner of Sixth and Market streets, about six weeks before I entered Providence Hospital. I gave \$23 for the overcoat, the price of which was \$25, but in consideration of the lateness of the season an abatement of \$2 was made.

Q. Who gave you the money to purchase it?—A. It was my own money.

Q. Did anybody give it to you for that purpose?—A. No, sir; it was my own money.

Q. Did your brother know that you had an overcoat?—A. I do not know whether he noticed my clothes. When I entered Providence Hospital I was assigned to the Saint John's medical ward. The sister in charge was Sister Vincent. I was carried by a friend up stairs because it was with the utmost difficulty that I could move one leg before the other. As soon as I got into the ward I took off my overcoat and placed it in a chair together with my hat. In that overcoat was a pair of very valuable gloves, which I have since given to Henry Baer, the nurse at the Freedmen's Hospital when I was a patient under him, and there were private papers. Sister Vincent came into the ward shortly after I arrived, took my hat and overcoat, and said, "Mr. Felton, I will carry your clothing out into my mess-room and lock them up for safe-keeping." That was on the 22d of April, 1877, to the best of my recollection. From that day to this I never have seen the overcoat. I did not have occasion to use it while I was in the hospital, but on the day of my departure I asked Sister Vincent, who had charge of the room where I was, to get my overcoat, and she left and returned in a short time and said that the overcoat could not be found. The papers and the gloves which were in the pockets of that overcoat were sent to me in my room.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. After this or before?—A. I was removed to the room, I think, a few weeks before I left the hospital. When I was removed my shirts and undershirts and clothing were carried to my room. After I had been in that room about a week I found my private papers and my gloves put on the table in my room, and I do not know who put them there. When Sister Vincent told me that the coat could not be found, I then went up to the sister who had charge at that time of Saint John's medical ward, who is called Sister Flavia, and who succeeded Sister Vincent in the charge of that ward, and asked her for my overcoat. She said, "I cannot find it; you can go into the mess-room and look among the clothing." I did so; the coat was not there. Said I, "Sister, who took my private papers and my gloves out of my coat?" She says, "I did." Said I, "Where is that coat?" My private papers were in an envelope like that [exhibiting an envelope], and my name was written on it in a feminine hand. Said I, "Sister, who wrote my name on that envelope?" She said she did. Then I said, "It is very extraordinary that you cannot account for my overcoat, for here are the private papers, and here are the gloves, which you yourself admit you took out of the pockets of the overcoat; and yet the overcoat itself you cannot produce or give me any information about." I can understand what became of that overcoat. Attached to the wards there was a mess-room; in that mess-room there were closets which contained the medicines to be given the patients, and also the patients' clothing, which the sister of the ward was invariably in the habit of taking away from the patients and locking up. The sister had charge of the keys of these closets. She was in the habit of having paupers from the government

ward attend to domestic duties in the mess-room, such as giving out the meals, washing the dishes, washing the floors, and doing all the menial service of the hospital. This Sister Flavia was a very careless woman, and when she would leave her mess-room and go into the ward to give out the medicines, she would leave, repeatedly, the keys in her closets, and the doors open, as I myself have seen on many occasions. In fact, there was one patient in our ward who was in the habit of watching Sister Flavia, and when she would come into our ward to give out the medicine, he would slip, into her mess-room, go to the closet, take out the whisky-bottle, take a drink, and put it back, and then go out again before she returned.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You saw that yourself?—A. I did.

Q. Were you in a private room at that time?—A. No, sir; I was in Saint John's medical ward. If I had not been I should not have known that. Undoubtedly some one of these pauper patients—and I must say that some of them are very dishonest, tramps and persons of that character—who had access to the mess-room and who were allowed to be there when the sister was away and when her closets were open, examined the clothing, and finding a very nice overcoat, took it. That is the way I account for the loss of that overcoat. I will say still further that so far as the loss of the overcoat was concerned, I am a man who takes those things with the utmost composure. I have lost a large quantity of clothing at the Freedmen's Hospital recently, and I have said nothing about it to Dr. Purvis or to Dr. Palmer—made no claim.

Q. Did you tell them anything about all this burglarizing that you have spoken of?—A. Dr. Purvis himself, on Wednesday, if I am not mistaken, called me into Brown's room and for the first time told me that my clothing had been stolen.

Q. What clothing did you have that was stolen? Name the articles.—

A. I will say this, that my clothing was intrusted to the nurse, Lucius Harcomb, and with his assistance I made out the list, and I think that I sent it by him.

Q. State the articles.—A. I will state the articles as far as I can. There were eight shirts; there was one undershirt; there was one very elegant new cravat that had just been sent me from Philadelphia; there were a dozen new handkerchiefs that had just been sent me from Philadelphia; there were five pairs of stockings that had just been sent me from Philadelphia. They sent me six pairs.

Q. Who sent them?—A. My brother. They sent me six pairs, and one pair I had worn, and had it under my bed at the time, so that was saved. The nurse informed me that my frock-coat and vest were taken. I will say this, that I have not been into the baggage-room at all, and of course I had to rely entirely on the representation of the nurse who had charge of my clothing. And in addition to that, the nurse reported that eleven of my collars were taken.

Q. Was anybody else's clothing taken?—A. Yes, sir; a man named Whitcomb, a man named George W. Dempsey, and the nurse told me that Mr. Smallwood's coat was taken. Mr. Whitcomb told me last night that \$75 would not restore the articles that were stolen from him.

Q. Do charity patients at that hospital—and they are all charity patients—go there as well clothed as that?—A. No, sir; and that is a very extraordinary circumstance which I am glad you mentioned. There was an extraordinary amount of valuable clothing in the baggage-room at that particular time. Mr. Whitcomb, who was remarkably well

dressed for a hospital patient, had come but a short time before, and had a valise. There was an old soldier named Dempsey, who had come from the Soldiers' Home at Hampton, and he had a valise, and had an unusual quantity of clothing. The nurse had, on the preceding Saturday, brought back a very large wash that belonged to me, and all this clothing, which was of extraordinary value for such a place as that, was collected together there, and Mr. Harcomb, the nurse, told me that he never knew so valuable a collection of clothing to be in that baggage-room at one time before; and that shows very conclusively that some person that had access to that baggage-room must have known precisely the time when to steal the patients' baggage, because there was an extraordinary amount of valuable clothing.

Q. Does this Mr. Harcomb have charge of it?—A. Harcomb and Sanders have charge of it. I will say still further that the room was kept in a very careless state; that the window which led out on the porch was open at night, although I had frequently requested the nurse to have it nailed down, as I was afraid my clothing would be taken.

Q. Which nurse?—A. Mr. Harcomb.

Q. Did Mr. Harcomb neglect to do it?—A. Mr. Harcomb himself told me the window was open.

Q. He neglected to nail it down when you requested?—A. That I do not know. He told me the window was open.

Q. Then a person from the outside could get in through that window?—A. That is the way that I and the other patients account for it.

Q. Then why do you say that it was somebody from the inside of the hospital that did it?—A. I did not.

Q. Mr. Sanders was in the hospital, was he not?—A. No; he was not. But you did not understand me, sir. I said that it was a person perfectly familiar with the baggage-room undoubtedly, because he was able to go into that baggage-room late at night, in the darkness, and put his hands right on the valuable articles, to the exclusion of worthless ones; that it was not an actual inmate of the hospital at the time, as I was satisfied and other patients were satisfied, from the fact that a new night nurse had just come on that night into our ward, and as a new broom sweeps clean, he kept awake that night, although he has not kept awake any night since, and Brown, the night nurse, went down stairs into ward No. 1, and, as that was his first night there, he undoubtedly was awake at that time; and, still further, if a patient had got out of bed and had gone back into that entry, some patient would have been there awake, or would have been aroused, and would have noticed it.

Q. Leave the patients out of sight; here was the window open on a porch; any person going by could see that the window was open?—A. No, sir.

Q. Could not any burglar prowling around the place find it open?—A. Burglars would not be likely to undertake a burglarious operation at a charity hospital.

Q. Why not?—A. Simply because they would not expect to get anything but rags. If a man is going to run the risk of his safety and commit a burglary, he is going somewhere where he is likely to find some valuable articles, either jewelry or valuable clothing, and is not going to a charity hospital, where nine-tenths of the patients are clothed in rags; at least I should suppose so.

Q. On these premises, and knowing nothing more about it than you have stated, you do not hesitate to accuse Mr. Sanders, an employé of the hospital, or to say you were satisfied he did it?—A. I did not say so.

Q. I so understood you?—A. I said that the circumstantial evidence points to that man. I do not charge him directly.

Q. These are your premises and your circumstantial evidence?—A. Circumstantial evidence points directly to that man, and not only that, the detectives who examined it were satisfied that he was the man.

Q. Who are those detectives?—A. Mr. Coombs and Mr. Miller.

Q. They told you they were satisfied he was the man?—A. They did not tell me so.

Q. How do you know they were satisfied, then?—A. They told some one else.

Q. Whom else did they tell?—A. Mr. Calvert, the engineer. I have that information from him.

Q. You have the information from Mr. Calvert that these two detectives said they thought Sanders did it?—A. That was the information I had from him. It was either Mr. Sanders or Mr. Potter; I will not be sure which. It was either Mr. Sanders or Mr. Potter. These matters have not made much impression on my mind.

Q. But it was Mr. Sanders or Mr. Potter?—A. It was either Mr. Sanders or Mr. Potter that said to me that the detectives were satisfied that it was the assistant nurse.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You mean Calvert?—A. It was either Calvert or Potter that informed me that the detectives were satisfied that it was the assistant nurse, Henry Sanders, who committed this burglary.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. And that these detectives told them so?—A. I did not say that. They did not tell me that.

Mr. EATON. This is an episode.

The WITNESS. Yes, sir; and I should like to proceed.

Mr. SARGENT. Go on.

The WITNESS. I abandoned Dr. Glennan's ward at my own request, because of its extreme offensiveness and my perpetual apprehension—

Mr. SARGENT. That you testified to before. You can make any statement you see fit without repeating your former testimony. The time of this committee is valuable, if yours is not.

The WITNESS. Certainly it is.

Mr. EATON. We want to hear everything you have to say with reference to the attack of the sister, as you call it.

The WITNESS. I have—I have very fully explained it.

Mr. EATON. If you have not done so, go further.

The WITNESS. I will go on. [Reading.] I say that at no time, under no circumstances, and to no person whatever—

Mr. SARGENT. It is not necessary for you to read an editorial article. If there is any statement you wish to make that you did not make before, you can now do it.

The WITNESS. I will, sir. Since my examination I have made a very careful investigation among my private papers, and I have found the original draught of the letter written by me to Dr. Palmer, complaining of the wretched food furnished me, which I will submit :

FREEDMAN'S HOSPITAL, *July 31, 1877.*

SIR: Will you be pleased to direct that I shall hereafter be provided with proper food? The meals served me are so miserable and repulsive as to force me to leave them wholly untasted or only partially consumed. The provender is so bad in quality and meager in quantity that it fails to appease hunger, and I am losing flesh and strength for want of suitable nourishment. My physical condition requires sufficient

food of decent quality, which is all I expect or desire; but I cannot exist on stale, sour, and unbuttered bread and musty hominy, which constitute the chief articles of my diet.

Yours, &c.,

F. E. FELTON.

Dr. PALMER.

I have also found the original draught of the letter which I wrote to Dr. Palmer, complaining of the vile condition of the water-closet attached to ward 2:

FREEDMAN'S HOSPITAL, *September 15, 1877.*

SIR: More than three weeks ago the engineer tore to pieces the water-closet of our ward, No. 2, and left it in a dismantled condition, and it so continues, to the great inconvenience and annoyance of the patients.

In the interval, buckets containing excrement have stood in the room throughout the day and night, emitting a noisome effluvia that pollutes the air. Patients use the wash-sink for urinating, and the apartment presents a revolting appearance, especially at night, when it is most used by the patients, and early in the morning, when the filth of the preceding night has accumulated.

In behalf of the patients, you are earnestly requested to have the water-closet repaired as soon as practicable, and also station a urinal in the room, without which the place cannot be kept clean, as the head nurse attests, nor will the privy otherwise be fit for use, as the seat and adjacent floor become saturated with urine and slops, which in emptying are showered thereon, causing the room to be defiled so that the patients are seriously incommoded and subjected to danger of contracting disease from the virus deposited on the seat.

The patients have long hoped that this grievance would be remedied by the proper authorities; but as there is no prospect that the evil will be rectified without your intervention, you are solicited to have the needed improvements effected and the water-closet placed in fit condition for the patients' use at an early date, and thus materially promote their safety and comfort.

Respectfully,

F. E. FELTON,

For himself and fellow-patients.

Dr. G. S. PALMER,
Surgeon in Charge.

That is the original draught. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that that letter was written more than two weeks after the charges of malfeasance and dereliction of duty were filed with the Secretary of the Interior, against Dr. Palmer, and about three weeks, as far as I can recollect, after Dr. Palmer's return from his summer vacation, and if Dr. Palmer had properly attended to his duties in making his regular Saturday inspection, he would have noticed the vile condition of the water-closets, without rendering it necessary for the patients to call his attention to the nuisance.

I desire in this connection to show that William Brown, the night nurse who testified before this committee at its last session, is a self-confessed perjurer.

Mr. SARGENT. I do not know that that is your business.

The WITNESS. That his statement——

Mr. SARGENT. One moment.

The WITNESS. I beg pardon.

Mr. SARGENT. If you know, of your own knowledge, any fact different from what Brown testified to, you will state it.

The WITNESS. I will.

Mr. SARGENT. But you can do it without epithets.

Mr. EATON. It is proper to say to you that we are perfectly well aware ourselves that he has testified differently on different occasions, therefore it will not do any good for you to use harsh language about Brown. Brown has testified in two different ways. We are aware of that fact ourselves.

The WITNESS. Very well. I desire in this connection, in vindication

of myself, to read the whole or a portion of an affidavit voluntarily made by Brown, and which is on file in the Interior Department.

Mr. SARGENT. We have all those affidavits here, and it is entirely unnecessary.

The WITNESS. Will you let me call your attention to the fact that he contradicts distinctly the charge he made against me, of urging patients to testify, or ever intimidating them? I should like to read that in vindication of myself. It is:

Affiant emphatically denies that he ever stated that complaints against the hospital did not begin until Mr. Felton came. On the contrary, patients have always complained of poor food and unsatisfactory treatment since Dr. Palmer has had charge of the hospital, but were unable to obtain redress, abate their grievances, or make their complaints known to the Secretary of the Interior.

This affiant never said or thought that the patients who testified before the investigating committee were continually talked to by Mr. Felton and Johnson, and that they would not have testified as they did if they had not been urged to do so. On the contrary, Messrs. Felton and Johnson uniformly declared that they wished every person who should testify as complainant's witnesses should tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as they desired to acquaint the Secretary of the Interior fully and authentically how the hospital has been managed and the patients treated.

Q. (By Mr. SARGENT.) Who wrote that affidavit for Brown?—A. I wrote that affidavit at his request, and he took it down voluntarily to the magistrate's office on Seventh street alone, swore to it, brought it back, and handed it to me.

Q. Mr. Brown, from his testimony before this committee, is obviously a man of very slow and imperfect thought and utterance. The language which you have read is entirely above his comprehension.—A. That is all true; and I will state this, that I wrote this affidavit three or four times over before it was to Brown's satisfaction; that after the draught was finally completed he took it into his room, kept it one night, brought it back, said that he had read it, and that it was all right, and took it down voluntarily alone to the magistrate's office, and brought it back.

Q. Do you not know that three-quarters of that affidavit is above Brown's comprehension?—A. No, sir. I know that he knew every word of it, because I explained it to him, and I said, "Now, do you understand every word?"

Q. You schooled him and I coached him upon it?—A. No, sir; I never school or coach anybody.

Q. This affidavit evidently is not the production of Mr. Brown's mind.—A. Of course you as a lawyer understand that when a lawyer writes an affidavit he is not going to use the language, the precise phraseology, of the ignorant person. He is going to get his ideas with exactness and then express them correctly.

Q. Mr. Brown is not only ignorant but positively stupid and incapable of thinking many of the things that are there stated, no matter with what explanation.—A. Mr. Brown came back to the Freedmen's Hospital on Friday night in a maudlin state of intoxication.

Q. What Friday night?—A. The Friday night he appeared here as a witness. It was the first time that I ever saw him intoxicated, and I was surprised at it.

Q. He was not intoxicated when before the committee?—A. The next day he told me at my bed—he came in voluntarily—that he had gone out with a gate-keeper named Roby, that Roby had plied him with liquor, that he was unaccustomed to liquor, and that it affected him very seriously. Some one brought at that time the "Critic" to me, and in looking over it I read to him his statements. He said they were false. I told him he was a perjurer, to get out, leave my sight, and

bring every article that he had in his room belonging to me immediately to me, and never to speak to me again.

Q. Is this the kind of witness you rely upon to make out charges against the hospital?—A. I supposed him, until he had been tampered with, to be an honest man. That was his reputation at the hospital. Mr. Brown has been at that hospital ever since it was established, as he tells you, and he was at the former hospital for a series of years. I had supposed that he was an honest man until recently.

Q. What further statement have you to make that you did not testify to before?—A. I would like to testify in regard to another thing, that prior to the first investigation the bread supplied the patients was dingy, smelt offensively, and was nauseating stuff.

Q. All of that appears in your former testimony?—A. No, sir; I have not testified to it.

Q. It fully appears.—A. Then, can I go into another matter which shows that the hospital lost at least, last year, \$800 by the way that bread has been baked.

Q. You mean a pound of bread for a pound of flour?—A. There is no pound of bread for a pound of flour. It is 196 loaves for baking 246 loaves, or in other words, the baker receives 50 loaves of bread for baking 196, and he receives at least \$2.75 a barrel for baking each barrel of bread, and if he bakes ten barrels of bread for the hospital a week he makes \$27.50 a week out of the hospital, or \$1,430 a year.

Q. Do you know whether he is furnished with any other article except flour to make this bread, the raising materials, &c.?—A. Of course, if he makes the bread, he has to give his own labor; he has got to furnish the fuel, and he has got to furnish the yeast; but he makes the bread. Then, Dr. Palmer, in his annual report—

Q. We do not want arguments here, simply testimony. We have the report already.—A. These are facts. I am not going to make any argument, but to state a fact. If the committee do not wish information—

Q. Yes; all the facts witnesses can give.

Mr. ALLISON. We want every fact you have.

The WITNESS. I am stating facts.

Mr. ALLISON. Then go on.

The WITNESS. I will, but he directs me not to argue; I am not arguing; I simply wish to state a fact.

Mr. SARGENT. Obviously to the committee you are a swift witness.

The WITNESS. I am an honest witness.

Mr. SARGENT. That depends; and we have continually to direct your attention to the necessity of speaking of facts in your own knowledge as a witness.

The WITNESS. I am stating the facts from Dr. Palmer's statement.

Mr. EATON. Wait a moment.

Mr. SARGENT. This case is not now being summed up.

The WITNESS. I am not summing it up; I want to state facts.

Mr. EATON. If you want to state the amount of bread which a barrel of flour sends into the hospital, state it. We have had it all stated to us just exactly as you will state it; but suppose you state it too.

The WITNESS. Very well. I should like to show you, gentlemen, that Dr. Palmer, by his unbusiness-like way, has wasted the hospital appropriation. Is not that a material fact?

Mr. SARGENT. Provided you state facts within your own knowledge.

The WITNESS. I will. I am stating that right from his annual report. I do not want to argue the case at all; I want to state the facts.

Mr. SARGENT. You can do so and with less excitement and more of the air of a witness than you now have been exhibiting; that is all.

The WITNESS. Well, sir, I think the excitement is quite as much on your part.

Mr. SARGENT. Or else you may compel us to come to the conclusion, if we sit on that commission to which you referred as to lunacy, that Sister Beatrice was not so far wrong.

The WITNESS. You can come to any conclusion you please. If that is the case you had better have me sent to Nichols' instead of the Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. SARGENT. We have no power to send you anywhere.

The WITNESS. I should like—it appears to me, sir, that you are anxious to suppress facts instead of to get at the truth. I wish to tell the exact truth about this hospital.

Mr. SARGENT. That insults the committee.

The WITNESS. It does not.

Mr. SARGENT. And is unworthy of a disinterested witness.

The WITNESS. Very well, sir.

Mr. EATON. You ought not to use language of that character, especially after you are informed by one of the committee that this very testimony with regard to the amount of bread which a barrel of flour will produce was before us. The report in your hands of Dr. Palmer we already have. If you want to state it over again I shall be very glad to hear it.

The WITNESS. I do not wish to state anything that has been stated; but I wish to show, and I think it is an important matter, that Dr. Palmer has wasted the hospital appropriation. That is my point.

Mr. SARGENT. You can make your statement.

Mr. ALLISON. Give us the facts.

The WITNESS. If you will let me go on without interrupting me—I do not wish to make an argument.

Mr. EATON. Whether you will be interrupted or not depends on whether you proceed in the proper way as a witness. Go on, sir.

The WITNESS. Very well, sir, if you will let me make my statement (examining papers).

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Perhaps I can help you by asking a question. Do you claim that Dr. Palmer is wasting the funds of this institution?—A. I do.

Q. Wait a moment till I finish the question—because he has made an arrangement by which a pound of flour shall be exchanged for a pound of bread.—A. I do most undoubtedly.

Mr. EATON. That is a fact.

The WITNESS. I do most unquestionably. I mean to say that over \$800 was wasted last year.

Mr. EATON. This is a claim that we shall take into consideration.

The WITNESS. Very well; but I should like to give you my facts.

Mr. EATON. You can give them. We have them all. Dr. Palmer states them.

The WITNESS. Dr. Palmer states them in his own way so as to make out that it is really a benefit to the institution.

Mr. EATON. A fact is a fact. Dr. Palmer has not argued this case to us, nor do we care to hear you argue it, but you say this—

The WITNESS. Very well. Let me then call your attention to one fact. Dr. Palmer alleges that for a good baker the cost of baking bread on the hospital premises would be for board and quarters \$40

per month; for fuel and other expenses about eight dollars a month, or forty-eight dollars a month, which for a year would be five hundred and seventy-six dollars. That is what he says would be the cost of baking bread on the hospital premises. I say that the cost of baking bread last year was over fourteen hundred dollars, or, in other words, that the hospital lost by this unbusiness-like way of obtaining the bread more than eight hundred dollars. That is my statement.

Q. (By Mr. ALLISON.) You are not a baker, are you?—A. I am taking his facts.

Q. And making an argument?—A. Well.

Mr. SARGENT. Now if you are through I wish to ask a question.

The WITNESS. I wish to state that Mr. Lewis Cogy, formerly night-watchman at the hospital, can enlighten the committee in reference to the question of the removal of bodies of patients by medical students at night from the hospital dead-house to Howard Medical College, and also as to the stealthy conveyance of suspicious boxes from the medical college to the vicinity of the dead-house by Charles Banks and his assistant, Wesley Lucas. Horace Sprague and Frank Lyons can testify that the corpse which was unearthed near the dead-house by Charles Banks, digging under the direction of Lieutenant Johnson, was buried there by Banks only three nights before its exhumation.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Why do you call it a corpse?—A. Because I always heard it spoken of as such.

Q. The testimony of the police and health officers, and everybody else there at the time of the exhumation, is, that it was a part of a skull and bones of a thorax, without arms or legs, that it was not a corpse, and that there was no flesh on it?—A. I have always heard it spoken of as a corpse.

Q. Have you talked with these witnesses recently?—A. What witnesses?

Q. Those you have now mentioned?—A. Have I?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I did not learn this fact about Mr. Cogy until within a day or two, when he accidentally talked to me.

Q. Did you talk with Horace Sprague and Lyons?—A. I have not spoken with Lyons for months, and I never spoke to him on this subject.

Q. And the other one?—A. I did once merely ask Sprague whether he knew anything about it, and he said he did.

Q. When?—A. I suppose three or four weeks ago.

Q. You have not seen any of them for three or four weeks?—A. I did not say that. I told you I saw Mr. Cogy lately. Sprague I did once ask if he knew anything about it.

Q. When was that?—A. I told you as near as I can recollect.

Q. Three or four weeks ago?—A. Three or four weeks ago.

Q. It is in testimony here that you are accustomed to school witnesses?—A. It is false.

Q. It is in testimony here, and I wish to give you an opportunity to reply to the allegation?—A. It is—

Q. One moment; hear me.—A. Certainly.

Q. It is in testimony here, by quite a number of witnesses, that you are accustomed to assemble persons about the hospital to school them, to tell them just what they should say, to correct them if their testimony does not accord with your ideas, and having so coached them to send

them to the various committees of investigation.—A. I wish to say right here and now that it is absolutely false.

Q. There is no truth in it whatever?—A. I mean to say that I am a lame person and cannot collect any witnesses, and every one that has come to me has come voluntarily, and that I have invariably said to every person, "Tell the truth and the exact truth, no matter whether it is for or against any particular person or persons; let the Secretary of the Interior or the proper authorities know precisely and authentically how this hospital has been managed." I have always said so invariably.

Q. Have you written down any affidavits for any persons in favor of the hospital?—A. Anybody?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I never knew anything that could be said in favor of that hospital under Dr. Palmer's management.

Q. You have never written down any such affidavits?—A. No, sir; and never shall.

Q. You have written down a great many for persons against it?—A. None that I know of. A great many, you say.

Q. You mentioned one.—A. You say a great many. No, sir.

Q. You have prepared those which have been written down?—A. No, sir; not a great many.

Q. Which have you written?—A. I wrote, at his request, as I told you, that of Mr. Brown.

Q. Never mind the request. Which did you write?—A. I will tell you. I wrote his. I wrote Lucius Harcomb's, stating—

Q. Never mind stating the contents. We have the affidavits.—A. Lucius Harcomb's.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Johnson's. Did you write anything for Johnson?—A. No affidavit. No, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. The charges you wrote for him?—A. I stated that I draughted the charges.

Q. State any other affidavit that you wrote.—A. I think I submitted three counter affidavits to the Secretary of the Interior. I have forgotten whose the third was.

Q. Did you write an affidavit for Nathan Street?—A. Yes, Nathan Street; that is the one.

Q. You say those are all?—A. They are all that I recollect. There may be more.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You never get excited about the hospital, do you?—A. Excited! I do get excited when vermin get on my clothing, and when bed-bugs get in my bed, and when rotten meat is brought me.

Q. I mean in conversation with the other inmates?—A. I am an emphatic, earnest man, as you probably see.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you hold meetings at your place and talk so loud and make so much disturbance that the nurses or watchmen are compelled to disperse the assembly?—A. Not that I have ever heard of.

Q. I ask you as to the fact?—A. I never heard of any watchman dispersing any assemblage. I know we have been surrounded by spies.

Q. No watchman has told you to cease that loud and boisterous conversation late at night?—A. I believe there was a drunken fellow

once came up, a man named Wall, a particular friend of Dr. Purvis, and on one occasion I think he said something of the kind; told Mr. Brown that he would not have so much noise, I think; but that man Wall was dismissed for improper conduct by the order of the Secretary of the Interior. He is not there now. He is a man that was formerly a police officer, and was dismissed for disorderly and drunken conduct on the police.

Q. How do you know?—A. By common report.

Q. You are testifying under oath, are you not?—A. By common report.

Q. At whose request was Wall dismissed from the hospital?—A. I do not know.

Q. At yours?—A. No, sir.

Q. At Mr. Johnson's?—A. Not that I know of. I know nothing about it.

Q. Does your brother send you money directly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he while you were in Providence Hospital?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?—A. I do not know. Because I suppose he thought, as I could not get out, I would not want money, and he sent all the money that was requisite for my expenses to Sister Beatrice. He never told me anything about it.

Q. Do you not know that he would not send it to you because he could not trust you with it?—A. He never intimated to me anything of that kind.

Q. Did he not give you money to go to San Francisco?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which was spent otherwise, and you did not go?—A. Let me explain that. You are going into family matters, but at the same time I am very glad you are. He gave me money to go to San Francisco, and I started for San Francisco and came here to Washington. I intended to go out with a gentleman to San Francisco, my former partner, Judge Titus, of Arizona. I was taken sick and was obliged to enter the hospital. That was the simple fact of that.

Q. You have no resources of your own?—A. No, sir.

Q. You live on the money given you by your brother and by the charity that you receive at this hospital?—A. I do not know about the charity. I am an inmate of the Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. A non-paying inmate?—A. I never heard that anybody paid.

Q. In a document which you submitted to the committee and which is published in the testimony, you recommend that paupers be removed from that hospital?—A. Certainly I do.

Q. Would not that remove you?—A. No, sir; because I am an invalid.

Q. An invalid pauper?—A. No, sir; I do not consider that I am. I do not consider that any sick person in a hospital is a pauper. That is a mere matter of judgment of mine.

Q. I wanted to know the discrimination you make.—A. I make this discrimination; that the Government of the United States never keeps an almshouse, and that paupers are the inmates of almshouses, but the Government of the United States supports this hospital and the inmates are not paupers, but they are patients. That is my distinction. Not only that, the law recognizes that distinction. Fifteen thousand dollars is appropriated a year to the Providence Hospital for the maintenance and support of poor, sick, and transient persons. It does not say "paupers."

Q. You yourself used the phrase "paupers" and I thought it a very harsh one, and that is the reason I called your attention to it.—A. Very well; let me explain then. There are able-bodied men there at the hos-

pital who are perfectly healthy and are simply paupers. They are not fit inmates of the hospital. That is what I mean by that word.

Q. Is Mr. Potter one of those?—A. No, sir; he is a man that has consumption.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. How did he get in?—A. Dr. Parvis turned him out, and the Secretary directed that he should go there.

Q. How do these paupers get there?—A. Heaven only knows; I do not; by favoritism, I suppose. I should like to state one more fact. During my sojourn at the hospital no female physician or female medical student has ever visited ward No. 1 or 2 while I was a patient therein except Miss Sargent and Nancy Stafford; that no person claiming to be chaplain has ever visited a patient in either of these wards and read to him, wrote his letters, or administered religious instruction or consolation; that a Catholic priest, Father McCarthy, is the only spiritual adviser that I have ever seen attend on the sick or the dying.

Mr. SARGENT. That is all, sir, if you are through.

The WITNESS. I submitted, when I was first examined, a list of improvements requisite to convert the Freedmen's Hospital into a proper sanitary institution, and which can be effected within the limits of the appropriation.

Mr. SARGENT. That is all printed.

The WITNESS. I wish to submit a supplemental list containing additional suggestions.

The paper is as follows:

Supplemental list of improvements requisite to convert the Freedmen's Hospital into a proper sanitary institution, and which can be effected within the limits of the current appropriation.

1. A bakery is imperatively required to be established on the hospital-grounds, so that good, palatable, and healthy bread may be always supplied at actual cost. Under the present faulty system flour is purchased on account of the hospital at \$7.50 per barrel, and sent from the warehouse to a small baker who could readily convert it to his own benefit by making it into good bread for his customers, while he furnished the hospital with a certain number of loaves of poor bread made out of musty, unmerchantable flour purchased at a trifling sum per barrel. That such exchange of flour and fraudulent imposition have been practiced on the government and patients is attested by the dingy, ill-smelling, and repulsive bread that was uniformly supplied the patients prior to the late investigation, and the door should be promptly closed on such flagrant malpractice and deception. A bakery, moreover, would be an extremely useful adjunct to the hospital, since, when not in use for producing bread, it could be advantageously employed in baking meats and other food for the patients' diet and thus variety could be introduced into the meals instead of the monotonous, rough fare provided them at present.

2. New and suitable furniture should be placed in the wards, and the comfort and wants of the invalids should be consulted and provided for.

3. Curtains should be put up at the ward-windows to shut out the glare of the sun from bedridden patients, and exclude the cold draughts of air which chill the sick and aggravate their maladies.

4. The ground, whereon the hospital-buildings severally stand, should be cleaned of rubbish and decaying matter and be thoroughly disinfected and regularly cleaned hereafter to prevent deleterious gases and miasmatic exhalations from arising therefrom to pollute the atmosphere of the wards, engender disease, or retard convalescence.

5. The hospital inclosure should be carefully policed daily.

6. A competent, honest person should be appointed steward, and exercise supervision and control over the kitchen and mess-room, select the cook, and be accountable that the meals are properly cooked and served. He should prepare an appropriate bill of fare for each day, subject to the approval of the surgeon-in-chief, and have the custody and distribution of all hospital supplies, and summarily reject all provisions that are not of standard quality.

7. A room separate and apart from the laundry should be appropriated to the reception and storage of unclean clothing, instead of depositing in the laundry, whereby

vermin are communicated to the clean clothing which is weekly distributed to the patients in the wards.*

8. The Secretary of the Interior might advantageously depute three intelligent and experienced persons as inspectors of the hospital, who should make frequent and unexpected visits to the institution, examine the buildings and premises carefully, investigate the condition and treatment of the patients, suggest remedies for existing abuses and needed improvements to increase its efficiency, and make a written report of their proceedings monthly to the Secretary of the Interior. A zealous, competent woman should be selected as one of the inspectors, as a woman would be better qualified than a man to make a proper examination of the female wards and ascertain the condition and requirements of the patients.

9. A house physician should permanently reside at the hospital and attend to all cases of emergency at night, instead of summoning inexperienced medical students in such contingencies, or wasting valuable time in sending for a surgeon to perform an operation in case of sudden accident, as at present.

10. The butcher, baker, milkman, coal-dealer, and retail grocer should be discarded, and tradesmen of approved integrity should be employed in their stead. All supplies should be purchased by contract, as far as practicable, in strict conformity to the statute in such case made and provided. Dishonest and incompetent employes should be discharged and trustworthy and efficient persons appointed in their place. The present employes, as a class, are falsifiers, hypocrites, and thieves, as might be expected from the character and practices of their employers.

11. The anomaly of a "slush fund" should no longer be tolerated as a device to pilfer from public treasures by covering up larceny, embezzlement, and frauds perpetrated on the government to the detriment of the hospital. All moneys received on account of the hospital should be covered into the Treasury, as required by law.

FRANKLIN E. FELTON.

WASHINGTON, *March 7, 1878.*

O. S. B. WALL (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside near the Freedmen's Hospital; right in the vicinity, two, three, or four hundred yards from it.

Q. Your name has been sent to this committee as a person who is personally acquainted with the conduct of the Freedmen's Hospital during the last two or three years. What do you know, of your own knowledge, about that?—A. I wanted to ask a little liberty, if the honorable Senators would permit, to make a little statement. I do not ask you to violate the rules for me, but that does not just represent me exactly. I wish to make a little statement with reference to myself, a personal matter. I have been brought into this matter without my seeking—very foolishly, I think. Some time ago, some few days ago, perhaps a week ago, somebody from Wall & Robinson's store made a sworn affidavit here with reference to myself. If the committee would permit me to have that referred to so that I could speak with reference to that matter—

Q. You mean the testimony of your brother?—A. No, sir.

Q. [Handing to the witness the affidavit of Mr. DeMott.] Is that it?—A. [After reading the affidavit.] Thank you, gentlemen, for permitting me to read that. I wanted to say that, in 1873, several years ago, I became acquainted with the firm of Wall, Robinson & Co.; that was before they got into a fuss, a trouble; a little quarrel among themselves. This whole thing is got up with that sort of animus. I did a good deal of trading with them. I traded several hundred dollars' worth for myself and boys. I induced a number of my friends to go there. They would say to me, "If you have any friends, or anybody that wants clothing, get them to come and see us, and do what you can." I said, "Certainly, I will." I had done it on a number of occasions, and had traded with them two or three hundred, or probably several hundred dollars' worth. One day when I went in to settle my account (it

was just \$40 exactly), Mr. Robinson met me and said, "Mr. Wall, I am going to surprise you this morning." I went in to pay them the account and intended to do so. It was an amount charged against me. Said I, "Surprise me how?" Said he, "We have an account against you of just about the amount we are going to make you a present of." "How is this present?" said I. Said he, "You have been a good friend of ours; you have helped us considerable." I said I was not aware of it. Said he, "Well, we feel just so; we are going to do that thing for you." Said I, "Does your partner know about this, does he understand this?" Said he, "Certainly." Mr. Wall stood a little piece off. I accepted it, thanked them, which I should do again if they did it, and went home and told my wife about it. The matter passed off until about a year or year and a half ago, when I was sued. He first sent me notice. I supposed he had made a mistake. I was certain I had a receipt in full and had not traded a dollar since but what I had paid those gentlemen for out of my pocket. In a few days they sent a summons. That stirred me up. Said I, "Perhaps there is something in this." I went down and called Mr. Wall's attention to the matter and said, "This is the first time I ever was sued in my life. What do you mean? Are you sure it is right?" He said, "There is an account standing here against you." Said I, "You certainly ought to remember; Mr. Robinson said you understood about it. He told me I had been a good friend of yours and had traded very much with you, and it has been about a year and a half ago since I think you made me a present of so much as stood to my account." "O," then said he, "I know, I understand all about it." Now, whether he meant the Freedmen's Hospital influence or not, I do not know. I never had used any for them, never had intended to do so, except that I asked Palmer once if he would not give this man, Robinson, the trade since they had dissolved. Palmer said, "No; I am trading with Mr. Wall; he is a very nice man." Said I, "That is all right; I think he is," or some such expression as that I made use of, never having any knowledge in my life of having done anything for the Freedmen's Hospital. I would just as soon have asked them or any other friends in the world to have traded with him as any; but in consideration of that I had no sort of knowledge of this being that way. Mr. Wall knew it, was cognizant of the fact just as much as Mr. Robinson, about the present of that amount, because I had traded several hundred dollars with them and sent them good customers, and he said in consideration of that he would do it without any mention of the Freedmen's Hospital in the premises.

Q. Is this the matter which you wished to appear before the committee about?—A. Not altogether. That is my personal explanation with reference to that matter, and they can send out and bring in men to disprove my word in this District if they want to. Another matter that touches me particularly, a matter, too, that I am sorry to come before you gentlemen upon, is in regard to the reference made to me by Mr. Collins Crusor that I had intimated to him that if Dr. Purvis would give me so and so the thing could be stopped. I could not see what it had to do with Palmer and Purvis's crookedness at the Freedmen's Hospital, but it was lugged in. I wanted an opportunity to reply to that, which I do on my solemn oath. Some time ago, since this investigation commenced, Collins Crusor came to my office as a sort of go-between man between Dr. Purvis and other parties. I had been often before the committee that examined up at the Freedmen's Hospital spoken of, maligned, and blackguarded in that committee as being the person who instigated this investigation. I have been spoken of a number of times. I asked my friend, Mr. A. G. Riddle, why it was that I was spoken of

there at all. I say here that I never had anything to do with these charges, did not know that they were instituted at all until after it was, and read with as much surprise in the papers the charges and specifications as any other citizen. I have lived there by that hospital, and for years have been passing by; I used to occupy some representative character; I used to belong to the noted historical legislature here; and this was in my immediate neighborhood. This little prominence made these poor people come out on my pathway going to and fro, and they have told me hundreds of times of the mismanagement, the ill-treatment, the sort of food, the sort of treatment they had in that hospital for years. I simply had wished in my very heart that there might be some investigation of the matter; if even the one-fourth of what they said was true, I made all sorts of allowance about their complaining and that sort of thing, but God knows I had nothing to do with it except when the charges and specifications were made, I then hoped there might be a clean and fair investigation.

Q. Did you have meetings in your office and consultations in reference to this matter?—A. No, sir; not specially, but persons have been there.

Q. What persons?—A. Just let me go on and make my statement and I will come right to that. Of course I am under your control.

Q. Go on?—A. Thank you. After this investigation had commenced and I was in full sympathy with it, as every good citizen ought to be, on the statements made to me by honorable persons, though they were black, some of them, a good many white ones too; I then was perfectly quiet in the matter, doing nothing at all that I should not do, because I had a talk with Dr. Palmer and told him fully my sympathy with the arrangement; never said anything to him but I said worse to somebody else. Collins Crusor came to my office, and said he, "Wall, what have you got against Purvis?" "Purvis," said I; "nothing in the world; he and I are good friends." "Why," said he, "are you raking this thing in this way?" "Why," said I, "Crusor, I have not the honor to be the instigator nor originator of these charges at all; that I have not the honor to be; I am in sympathy with them, but I knew nothing of the commencement of them. Why do you appeal to me for it?" Says he, "Wall, if you will stop this thing, we know you have influence enough to do it; you can name anything you want; anything under God's heaven, only do not ruin that poor young man." I said, "I have not any more against Purvis than I have against my little baby. There is an investigation going on against Palmer and the hospital; and Purvis, big man, throws himself in the breach; that is his privilege." Then says I, "If there is anything that comes out he must catch the shots." "Well," said he, going, "say what you want; anything that you want you name it," and said he the last time he was there—for fear you will not give me time to give all the conversation—the last time he was there, said he, "Anything you name that you want under God's heaven you shall have, and I am authorized to say it to you, and I could have brought it to you in writing, but it would not be exactly proper to do so." That is what Mr. Collins Crusor said to me. We shook hands and pledged secrecy upon it. I said to him, "Collins, Purvis has not anything to give me; I do not want anything from him, nothing in the world;" and said I "I only want that those poor people be properly treated." Said he, "Wall, we care nothing about Palmer; we would just as soon Palmer was out as not; we would rather have him out of the way; only we want to get Purvis in, we want to have him, that is all; God knows that is all. I am saying to you the strictest truth." He said it with emphasis over and over to me. I said, "Crusor, I want nothing; Purvis has nothing to give me. I want those poor people properly treated, that is all, and all the interest I have in the matter."

Collins knows that I did say so. "Now," said he, "don't say anything about this, will you?" Said I, "Certainly not," and I should not until I was released by his coming before the committee here and referring to the matter; never would have done it; never would have come before this committee; did not go before the other because I did not want anything of that kind, because I had no personal direct knowledge except hearsay, and my being a sort of one-horse lawyer I knew if the committee had a mind to adopt the rules as they do in court I would not be likely to have anything at all to say directly and positively. I have been in the wards some few times, but not enough to notice very much, but I could say that they were not in such condition as I consider a well-regulated hospital.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You thought so from what you saw?—A. Yes, sir; I did, because I had the honor once of being a colored captain in the Army, and was thrown, at Beaufort, S. C., sick in the Sands House there, looking over on to Saint Helena; I was in that hospital ten days, and I had been in other hospitals at Charleston, while on duty there in my official position, and I had seen them kept differently. The atmosphere was bad, and the bedding and all that sort of thing looked bad, very, but not enough to make me want to come before a committee to make any statement about it. I had never thought of doing so at all. I wanted to deny this statement and give the facts with reference to what Mr. Collins Crunser said, and that I never said to him that I complained that I wanted Purvis to give me something—never in the world.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Now, I should like to ask you a few questions, if you will sit down. You were furnishing goods to the hospital up to October, 1876?—A. Not I; a partner of mine.

Q. What was the name of your firm?—A. It was Wall & Fink.

Q. You ceased furnishing them about that time, did you not?—A. About which time?

Q. About October, 1876.—A. I cannot give the dates, but it was some time, I think, before the investigation began, but I have no data with me to give dates.

Q. Did Dr. Palmer complain that your firm was charging too high prices?—A. Not more than the usual complaint; no, sir.

Q. Did he not call your attention to it in writing?—A. Furnishing more than others?

Q. That you were charging higher prices?—A. No, sir; he did not.

Q. We have here a copy of a letter, furnished by the Interior Department, which reads as follows:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL AND ASYLUM,
Washington, D. C., October 7, 1876.

O. S. B. WALL, Esq.:

I have been comparing the prices charged by Charles Fink & Co. for groceries and supplies furnished this hospital, and I find they are very much higher than I pay for the same articles at other places. For instance: I pay for soda-crackers seven cents per pound. You charge ten cents; a difference of 42 per cent. I pay for potatoes one dollar. You charge \$1.25; difference 13 $\frac{7}{10}$ per cent. I pay for cheese fifteen cents per pound. You charge twenty cents; a difference of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. For candles I pay sixteen cents. You charge eighteen; difference 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. You see the average percentage is very large.

My directions to Dr. Glennan were to send a very large proportion of orders to you, and to continue the patronage to you so long as the quality of the goods and the prices are the same as are obtained at at other places.

Very respectfully, &c.,

GEO. S. PALMER,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

A. Now, let me reply to that.

Q. Did you receive that letter?—A. I did not receive it.

Q. Did your firm?—A. I think Mr. Fink did something to that account. Now let me say with reference to that matter and this letter. Mr. Fink had been furnishing a number of goods. I do not know whether we were high or not; that makes no particular difference if we were, so far as this matter is concerned, but we may have on some of these articles furnished high, but not higher than a great many others had furnished and been paid for; which Palmer, himself, confessed in a conversation with him, and so did his receiving-man there—the one-legged man. But I knew nothing particularly about this, because Charley was at the store. He was a sort of a partner with me; that is, I furnished part of the capital. It was a little store near the hospital. Dr. Palmer and Dr. Purvis proposed to send orders there. Some of the times I would be there. I do not know that I ever saw that letter; yet Charley may have mentioned it to me.

Q. Dr. Palmer ceased trading with you, did he not?—A. No, not at that time; no, sir; not at all.

Q. Did you reduce your prices?—A. I do not know as to that. We went on furnishing.

Q. How long after that?—A. I cannot tell you how long—quite a time.

Q. Two or three months?—A. I think all of two or three months, but I am not certain.

Q. Longer than two or three months?—A. You are pressing me about a matter that I have not any data on.

Q. After this trade was taken from the firm, then you found that the hospital was in very bad condition?—A. No; do not make that statement for me. If you and not I am going to testify—

Q. Very well, I want to know if your interviews with persons with reference to this hospital, &c., and your discoveries with reference to the hospital, were made during the time you were trading with the hospital?—A. If I may be allowed—

Q. You are allowed anything exactly as any witness.—A. If I may be allowed, I want to ask the Senator not to infer that I said I had conferences, and take it for granted. There has been no such thing in my evidence or examination-in-chief that I have stated.

Q. You spoke of persons who conversed with you with reference to the affairs of the hospital?—A. Certainly; a number of them.

Q. Was that before or after that?—A. What—the conversation about the affairs of the hospital?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Before and after, a number of times by the most honorable citizens in the District, and lots of them.

Q. State those most honorable citizens of the District who conversed with you about it.—A. Well, there is Dr. Joseph, the disbursing officer in the Interior Department.

Q. Did he tell you the affairs were not well conducted?—A. I do not know that he did. I said he conversed with me.

Q. Name the next; I speak about persons with complaints.—A. I do not remember. If you will give me until to-morrow, I will get you a list of names and bring them in. I do not know that I can on the spot without any sort of notice; but I will name a number of honorable citizens, white and colored, who spoke to me about the matter.

Q. Who complained of the hospital management?—A. I have not said that, but who have asked me in reference to the matter.

Q. Then I will ask you another question. Did you send for James

Hurd, one of the nurses, and Fanteroy, a cook, to come to your office to talk to you about hospital matters?—A. No, sir; not if a hundred of them should say so.

Q. At a time when Chase and Dr. Augusta were with you at your room?—A. Is that question included in the first? Is that a continuation?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. No, sir. I did not know but it was a separate question.

Q. Were Dr. Augusta and Chase with you?—A. At what time?

Q. At any time consulting with reference to the matter of making this investigation successful?—A. O, no, sir; we have talked there casually and informally a dozen times certainly about the hospital matter.

Q. Did you say to your brother that if he would take hold and help this investigation and get these persons out it should not hurt him; that he would get better prices for his milk?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or anything of that kind?—A. No, sir. I will state in reference to that. My brother, A. G. Wall, came to me and told me that if he had a mind to he could go into this thing, and, says he, "There is not any of them that knows more; I could perfectly burn these hospital fellows up; but," said he, "my bread and butter depends on it and I am not going to do it." That is what I am telling you, under oath, that he said to me.

Q. Your brother also testified under oath?—A. I have not said that he did not. I am simply stating that in reference to myself.

Q. Why do you repeat that you are under oath? We know you are under oath. Proceed and give your testimony.—A. Yes, sir; it was a sort of addendum, but I will not say it any more if it is against the rules. I wanted simply to say this, that my brother said that to me. I said to him, "Whatever you know go and tell under oath—nothing that you do not know—nothing that is not correct, and so far as my influence is concerned, if there is a reorganization there, it will never harm you any." I said just that, honorable Senators, and nothing further to him, and nothing to any human being. The idea of my trying to induce anybody to testify what was not true!

Q. You did not say to him that if he would take hold and assist in getting out Dr. Palmer, he should get a better price for his milk, or anything of that kind?—A. Why, certainly not.

Q. You did not say to him that these persons ought to be turned out because if a colored man got the furnishing of the milk the price was cut down?—A. Why, no, sir. I told him that since colored persons had gotten it, it was cut down, which was a fact and will be shown upon the records, and they cannot dodge it.

Q. You did not tell him that if you could accomplish your purpose, which you were positive of doing, of putting a man in the hospital that you could control, he need not be afraid at all, he should not be removed from his present position of furnishing milk to the hospital?—A. Why, certainly not. The poor fellow has been gotten up to make this statement. Certainly not. I do not talk any such way to anybody.

Q. You contradict your brother in these particulars.—A. I make my say. If it contradicts him, it does.

Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Hoover in the hall of the Patent Office, in which you offered Mr. Hoover the supplying of the meat for the Freedmen's Hospital for a bonus?—A. No, indeed. The only time I ever saw Mr. Hoover, he came to me in the little Northern Liberty Market and said to me, "Mr. Wall, they tell me you are a man

of a good deal of influence, and if you can get me the supplying of the meat I will make it interesting to you; I can afford to." I said, "Now, Hoover, if I can say any good word for you, I will." I told him so three or four times. I do not think I mentioned his name to anybody, for I do not have any respect for a man who approaches me with a bonus in an unfair way. I got rid of him in that sort of way. I say that I did not.

Q. You did not say to him that you would get him the chance of supplying the meat if he would pay you a bonus?—A. No, sir; I did not. I say that. I answer that square.

Q. Did you not say to Dr. Purvis that if he would get you the supplying of the meat and coal and groceries, his (Purvis's) groceries and meats should not cost him anything?—A. No, sir; most certainly, sir, that I did not. I ask your pardon for saying I swear to it. I certainly did not.

Q. Did you go to Secretary Schurz and ask him to readmit Potter to the hospital after his discharge?—A. I do not think I did. I went down two or three times to do it—to ask him to readmit Mr. Potter—but I do not remember whether I got to see him or not.

Q. When Mr. Felton went to see the Secretary, did you bring him back in a carriage?—A. No, sir; I never was in a carriage with Mr. Felton, except from my office to the hospital, in my life. I paid Mr. Prior a dollar to take Mr. Felton, because he told me he wanted to go, all of which I would do again. I had a right to do it.

Q. I am not questioning your right; I am simply trying to get to the point whether you had taken an interest in the investigation more than an ordinary citizen, and whether it had any connection with your business affairs, and the fact of their ceasing to allow you to supply groceries. I notify you that that was the object of the question.—A. Senator, I am much obliged to you. I am in sympathy with it, because I believe there is crookedness there.

Q. It had nothing to do with the fact that they ceased buying groceries and things of your firm?—A. No. Now here is another point, that I kept right along after this investigation commenced, furnishing milk there right straight along. I did not get the milk-furnishing from Dr. Palmer; I got it from his predecessor, Dr. Reyburn, and then continued along with them, and continued after the investigation commenced some little time, two or three months.

Q. Did you have a meeting at your office when there were present, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Chase, and Mr. Potter, on this subject?—A. Not a special meeting; they have been all there several times.

Q. Were they caucusing on this subject?—A. I do not know, sir; we were talking about it as citizens had a right; we were all in sympathy with the investigation and we talked about it.

Q. Assisting it along?—A. I hope we were, if it was right to assist it; if it was wrong, I am sorry for it.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. When did you first become acquainted with this hospital?—A. I have known it ever since it was built and put there—before even the patients were removed from what was called Campbell Barracks.

Q. You spoke of having a place not a great way from the hospital?—A. That is my residence, my home.

Q. Were you in the hospital frequently during Dr. Reyburn's time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As frequently as you have been since?—A. Just about.

Q. What is your opinion with regard to the condition of the hospital five years ago as compared with it one year ago?—A. Well, sir, I considered it very much better under Dr. Reyburn's management, than since, because I consider that these gentlemen did not attend to their business since they took charge, that is along for quite a while. I think they have been very much on the alert since the investigation commenced, but I think they did not attend to their business near so well before. I think everything was sort of loose; nobody cared anything particularly about it, and they were spending very little time at the hospital, as I have seen myself.

Q. Did you express such opinion to these men as you knew them and were in the hospital and interested in it?—A. No, sir; I did not express these opinions to them. I know now since the matter is up and remember the condition the thing was in before, and how it has been since, that I am satisfied it was very much better run before, according to my opinion.

Q. In what particular?—A. As to cleanliness.

Q. Take that point. Go back three years or four years, if you please, before the present surgical force was there. Take any ward that you like—the first or the second ward. Do you remember passing through those wards two, three, or four years ago? I am very frank to tell you why I ask this question. We have had testimony before us by competent people, and I suppose honorable people, who speak of the cleanliness of the wards then, and compare it with the cleanliness of the wards now. I do not say how they compare them, but they give their opinion. Now, you have spoken of the cleanliness. If you remember the condition of any ward—no matter what ward—but any one you please, in Dr. Reyburn's time, compare it with its condition a year ago before the investigation.—A. Now, let me say just this much. As to having a direct and exact minute recollection, except this sort of general impression that I would get so many years ago as Dr. Reyburn was there, that general neatness and order and system seemed to prevail there at that time. Since that time I have been struck because I have passed into the ward over next to the park. I do not know the number of the ward. I did go in on one or two occasions to see Dr. Palmer, maybe to get him to sign some pay-bill or speak to him about it, a year ago or more—about the time we were furnishing—and the stench and the deadly sickening atmosphere, and then the general appearance—I cannot particularize other than just that, and that is what I intended to say in my evidence, that I could not speak of my own personal knowledge; that is what I have said all the time, and that the most I could say was hearsay.

Q. We do not want any hearsay.—A. I do not propose to give any. I am only giving what my impression was at the time, without being able to particularize, when Dr. Reyburn was there, and what the feeling was when I have been in, about a year ago.

Q. Let me tell what I want to get, if you have any recollection of it whatever. You are an intelligent man, I see, and you say you are a part of a lawyer—A. A sort of one-horse one.

Q. Whether one or two horse, I do not care. No matter about that. You know that testimony, to be worth a copper, should go to the point. Now, if you can state in what degree or in what manner there was any difference in the cleanliness of wards in Dr. Reyburn's time and in this man's time, a year ago, I should be glad to hear it.—A. I can only say this: that then, from the appearance and atmosphere in Dr. Reyburn's time, everything was much neater and sweeter; the bedding, and the

floors, and all that sort of thing, which as a man would see in passing through.

Q. But there never was a hospital on the face of the earth but what at sometime emitted a stench; I do not care where the hospital is.—A. I am saying this: that since that time, the appearance, the smell, and all that, was very different.

Q. Were the floors cleaner?—A. Yes, sir; I will say it.

Q. That you will swear to?—A. I do swear to it.

Q. Were the beds cleaner?—A. The beds were cleaner.

Q. Had your attention been directed to that?—A. Not particularly. I say the floors were cleaner, and the beds were cleaner. I only speak generally.

Q. Were the walls cleaner?—A. I do not know now that I directed my attention to the walls.

Q. You did to the floors and bedding?—A. I say so far as appearance goes; I did not go in as an inspector.

Q. No matter whether you did or did not, if you inspected.—A. I did in that sort of casual way.

Q. Was the clothing on the patients cleaner?—A. I cannot say as to that, because generally they are covered up in bed; but the beds and everything had a neater appearance in Dr. Reyburn's time than now, as I can recall and recollect; and I say this from my general impression. The honorable Senator recollects that I did not come here to testify specifically with reference to the workings of the Freedmen's Hospital, as I said, but to make those personal explanations, and this I only give as a general impression.

Q. You went into this, and going into it I want to see what the value of your testimony was.—A. That is all, Senators, just what I stated to you.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Did you know Assistant Secretary Gorham, of the Interior Department?—A. No, sir; I do not know him. I have no knowledge of him.

Q. He was Assistant Secretary under Mr. Chandler.—A. I do not know him that I know of. I have no knowledge of him.

Q. Do you not remember to have gone to the Interior Department and made a request there that Dr. Palmer should remain rather than that Dr. Reyburn should be restored?—A. I have done that, certainly. I helped to get him in his position after exhausting myself on Purwis.

Q. And you tried to keep him there?—A. I did for a while, certainly. All that is correct.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You say you tried to keep him there. How long did you try to keep him there?—A. I cannot tell how long I tried to. That would be an impossibility.

Q. A year?—A. It might have been two, but I cannot now say when he was put in.

Q. Do you mean to tell this committee deliberately that after getting a man in there and exhausting yourself—if I use your own expression—in order to get him in, you tried to keep him there for a year, perhaps two years, when all the while the hospital was not as well cared for as it was under the other man?—A. But I mean to say deliberately and squarely, and under oath, if you will permit me to say so—anything that I say I mean to say deliberately with due consideration and I mean to stick to it—I mean to say that after I did, and I think I did more to

do it than any other one man; Dr. Purvis used to admit that I did more to get Dr. Palmer there than probably any other man, after trying and exhausting on Purvis to get him appointed. I had my reasons for it, and they were simply that he was a colored man.

Q. Never mind about that.—A. They were good motives. I expressed them to him many times. After that we got Dr. Palmer there. I had a good opinion of him. I still have a rather good opinion of him; that he is a nice honest man, but not fit to keep a hotel, not fit to run a hospital. After that I did go to somebody in the Interior Department—if it was Gorham I do not know him, but I thought it was Assistant Secretary Bell.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. A nice, fine-looking man?—A. A splendid-looking gentleman; a nice gentleman; favors your honor somewhat.

Q. You think it was Bell?—A. I think so. I am not certain. I told him there was a sort of movement on foot with reference to Dr. Palmer, and that I hoped he would be retained. I did that at the instance of Dr. Purvis, who came to me and asked me to go down and see and do what I could to ward off that very matter.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Wait. That was about a year ago?—A. No, sir. The Senator don't catch me so easy as that, because I have asked questions myself in courts of law.

Q. When was it?—A. I said I could not tell, but it was some time ago.

Q. You said you went and called on a man in the Interior Department. I asked you if it was about a year ago, and then you volunteer to say that you are not to be caught in that way. There is no catching here.—A. No, I do not mean that.

Q. Then do not use such expressions.—A. I do not mean to refer to you in that sort of way. I ask your pardon.

Q. I treat you properly, and demand proper treatment.—A. I ask your pardon so far as making any reference of an unfair nature.

Q. When was it? Was it last year, or more than a year ago?—A. Since I asked him to have him retained?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I think it must have been as much as two years ago.

Q. How long has Bell been there, if it was Bell? Has he been there two years?—A. I am not certain that it was Bell. I think he has.

Q. Who was the Secretary of the Interior at this time, if you remember? I should like to identify the time if I can.—A. I will do my best for you. I think it was Mr. Chandler. I think he was there.

Q. Was he there two years ago?—A. O, certainly, sir. If this gentleman has not been appointed within the two years—I mean he was there as long ago as that. I think Mr. Chandler was there.

Q. Are you quite certain about that?—A. No, sir; that is my impression.

Q. Then I will drop it, because I only asked that question in order to identify the time if I could.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were anxious to retain Dr. Palmer?—A. I was, because I was anxious to have him appointed.

Q. Somebody was trying to get him out then?—A. There were some influences for that, so Dr. Purvis told me.

Q. I do not care how you arrived at the conclusion?—A. I thought I would tell that.

Q. Was the arrangement to get Dr. Reyburn back?—A. I think it was.

Q. You preferred Dr. Palmer to stay?—A. I think I did.

Q. Why?—A. Well, I had not any very particular reason at that time, except, I think, to accommodate Dr. Purvis. I had no particular reason, except that.

Q. Did you regard Dr. Palmer at that time—whenever it was that you went to the Interior Department and had this interview with the Assistant Secretary—as being as able and proper a man to be at the head of the institution as Dr. Reyburn?—A. I never considered him as able and as competent; no, sir.

Q. Then you desired a man who was not as competent, was not as able, was not as suitable, to remain there for some reason?—A. I did. I had a reason.

Q. What was the reason?—A. Well, sir, I am glad to give that. We had a good deal to do about the time Dr. Reyburn was there in the way of getting him out, because of his connection with the medical college, and his indisposition to grant certain privileges, as I understood, to the colored students, and that he had joined a medical society here that was at antipodes somewhat, at variance with our way of thinking. Dr. Palmer was supposed to be—was represented to be by Dr. Purvis—a man entirely in accord with the colored people and their interests in every respect. I was perfectly willing, being a colored man myself, and under those circumstances, to have him there, and I would forego a good many things with reference to doing homage to and following my convictions in that direction, the direction of being friendly, doing something to promote the best interests of the colored people, and I was willing to take a man that I thought was not so good, so fine an expert, or so practical an organizer and systematizer as Dr. Reyburn was, with better sentiments in my direction. I felt so.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. More in sympathy with the colored people?—A. Yes, sir; and that was all the reason. Dr. Purvis wanted me; Dr. Purvis and I were then good friends, and I wanted to do whatever he wished.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. In your opinion, what was Dr. Purvis's ability then as a physician?—I do not ask now.—A. As to then, I think just about the same as I do now. I think Dr. Purvis a good man, a young man inexperienced such as he is. I do not think Dr. Purvis's style and all that is the most pleasant, his bearing to friends or patients, or what not; I think it is austere, a sort of supercilious, and not pleasant. I wanted to help him, because he was a man of my color and complexion. I had just those feelings of doing what I could.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Is Dr. Palmer still in sympathy with the colored people, in your general ideas in reference to the hospital?—A. I do not know whether he is or not. I suppose he is not very different from what he was.

Q. He has not changed?—A. Not that I know of.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Is there anything else in particular that you would desire to state?—A. I did not know I would be questioned on any of these things; I came up to ask the privilege of making a personal statement.

Q. You have made it?—A. Yes, sir.

SATURDAY, *March 9, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

Dr. A. T. AUGUSTA (colored), sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Your name was given us as a person who could throw light upon matters connected with the Freedmen's Hospital. Make any statement that you desire to make in reference to it.—Answer. I am here entirely without my consent, and I did not want to have anything to do with this investigation. I have been connected with the hospital some time, it is true, but I prefer not to be mixed up with this investigation.

Q. You can make any statement of any facts within your knowledge, if you desire to do so. I do not know what you know.—A. I, of course, have some knowledge of the affairs of the hospital, having been connected with it from October, 1875, until June, 1877.

Q. You can make any statement that you wish to make about it.—A. There are some matters I know about that I do not care to state, and I prefer not to have anything to do with it.

Mr. EATON. You are here called upon as a witness, and to leave it in this position, stating that you know matters that you do not care about telling, would seem to imply that you know something against the management of the institution. You had better state your information.

The WITNESS. I have no fears of testifying, but it is only a question of propriety on my part, inasmuch as I had been an applicant for the position of surgeon in charge of the hospital, and did not wish to appear here as prosecuting the gentlemen already there who are being investigated. If the decision of the committee is that I shall go on, I will.

Q. (By Mr. SARGENT.) Go on and make your statement.—A. When I first became connected with the hospital, in 1875, I had orders to be at the hospital on Saturday morning for inspection, at eleven o'clock. I presented myself there at that hour, and went through the wards of the hospital with the other physicians and surgeons in charge; but I was struck with what I considered to be a perfect farce, as far as the inspection was concerned. The physicians walked right through the wards, without paying much attention to anything in them. It seemed to me to be a mere matter of form. Once in a while they would stop and examine a patient perhaps, and sometimes the water-closets or something like that; but so far as any minute inspection went, to see whether the hospital was really clean or dirty, it seemed to me to be a matter of farce; but, however, as I was connected with the hospital, and had orders to appear there for inspection, I always tried to be there at the hour designated. As far as the wards were concerned as to cleanliness, some of them were quite clean; others were not so clean. The odor of some of the wards especially, was very bad at all times when I have been there. There were three of them. I can recollect now especially, one of the female wards on the side attended by Dr. Palmer, and the two male wards, one I think attended by Dr. Purvis, and the other by Dr. Glennan. The odor and air of those wards was always bad, and I generally remarked it when I went through on inspection-day. There was something in those wards that was very disagreeable and bad; sometimes the ventilators were open, sometimes they were not. I suppose it does not make any difference to the committee

how I make my statements, with regard to the management and condition of the wards or anything.

Mr. SARGENT. Go on and make your statement in your own way.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You speak now of 1875, when you first went there?—A. It was so all the time up to the time I left there. From the time I went, in 1875, until I left, I found that to be so. Sometimes the water-closets were in bad condition, leaked. Very often in going through the wards on inspection Saturday morning we would find the water-closets leaking down over the companion way, where we had to pass through to go up. Then, in regard to the treatment of patients, I never thought that the colored people that were in the hospital had justice done them, from the fact that soon after I went there I was assigned to the duty of attending to the out-door patients, to prescribe for them as they came in every day from twelve to one o'clock; and soon after I went there there was a girl came in, a colored girl, between fifteen and sixteen years of age, with syphilitic disease; she was in a very bad condition; she said she was turned out of doors from the house where she was stopping; she had no means and nowhere to stay. I found she was in a horrible condition, and asked Dr. Palmer, surgeon in charge, if he would not admit her so that she could be treated in the hospital. I told him her condition. He said no, he could not admit her in that condition, but she could come in every day and be prescribed for. The girl remained about there and, as I was told, slept in the park adjoining there during that night, and the next day came in to be prescribed for, and I lost sight of her. They would not take her in, and of course she went off. There was a white woman admitted subsequent to that with the same kind of disease. Dr. Palmer admitted her and kept her in there, as near as I can tell, between two and three months, and treated her. I thought it was a piece of injustice that he should make that distinction.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Who has power to admit persons there?—A. The surgeon in charge.

Q. Does it not require the act of the Secretary of the Interior?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is not submitted to him at all?—A. No. The Secretary of the Interior could send a permit there to admit persons, but they were admitted without any permit from him at all. The surgeon in charge had full power, as I understood, to admit them. Then another thing, where I thought there was a distinction made. There were some white men who were taken there who were picked up in the street near the hospital drunk. Three cases I recollect especially. One of them was kept in perhaps three weeks. He is an old drunkard; and they thought if they could keep him in there awhile they would be able to reform him. Subsequent to that there was another man who had been in the hospital for some time and he was such a bad case that they would not keep him in. They turned him out. But on another occasion he was found lying drunk in the neighborhood of the hospital, and he was admitted and put into my ward. He was kept there awhile, and from there was transferred to Dr. Glennan's ward. The other case was a man who had at one time been in the volunteer service of the Army. The doctor thought he would keep him there; but he was in the habit of getting drunk. He thought by keeping him he would perhaps reform him. The man remained until he got over the drunken spell. I spoke to him

about discharging him; I thought he had been in long enough. He seemed to be over the drunk. Dr. Palmer concluded he would keep him longer. Subsequent to that I discharged him without consulting Dr. Palmer. Another case that I bring to mind now, in regard to treatment, was that there was an idiotic white man, who had been a patient around the hospital for a long while. He was in my ward. He was taken sick some time there with an abscess in the leg. He was a cripple anyhow, besides being an idiot, and in the ward I attended there was no night-watch, so that any bad cases were usually transferred to the other wards where they had night-nurses. I believe there was one on the female side and one on the male side where they had a night nurse, as far as I can recollect. This man was in such a bad condition that I asked Dr. Glennan, who had charge of the ward where there was a night-nurse, if he would not admit him in his ward. He excused himself for not admitting him, saying that the man was a very dirty man and he could not admit him there. However, the man got so bad that he was passing through the ward himself, a few days afterwards, while I was absent, and he admitted him into his ward, kept him in there about perhaps a week or so, and then returned him to my ward again. He was not near well, and took a relapse, and died soon afterwards. It was a case that I thought ought to be kept in the ward where there were proper nurses until he was thoroughly well.

Then, with regard to the treatment of some other cases—one especially that I wish to call your attention to is a woman who came in the ward to be attended in labor. She was, when I went in the room, in convulsions. We had had several bad cases of that kind there.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Was she a black woman or a white woman?—A. She was a black woman.

Q. Do you recollect her name?—A. I do not know that I knew her name at all. She was in labor when she came the night before. This was on Saturday, about inspection-hour. I went to the hospital to go the inspection, and not finding the other physicians going the rounds, I learned that they were in the room attending this woman in labor. I went in there, and Dr. Palmer and Dr. Glennan and Dr. Purvis were in the ward. Dr. Palmer was trying to apply the forceps so as to extract the child. He tried a long while before he succeeded in getting the forceps so that he could make any use of them. The instrument slipped off, and I suggested to them that I thought instead of delivering the woman in that way she should be delivered by perforation of the child; that is to say, to break the child in pieces and remove it. I was not heeded in that respect. No attention was paid to my recommendation, but they went on and tried to deliver her. Finally, Dr. Palmer delivered the head of the child, but they could not get the other parts away. Dr. Purvis then took either a roll of towels or a rope which was in the ward, I forget which—I may here mention that Dr. Glennan about this time had gone out—and fastened it around the child's neck and put his foot against the woman's body, and by the strength of his arm pulled the child away. That was treatment that I thought was not right, but, of course, I said nothing more about it.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You are now testifying on the question of skill?—A. I do not know what you may choose to call it, whether skill or the management of the case.

Q. You think you could have done it better than that?—A. I do not know that I should have done it that way at all. I think I should have tried to deliver the woman, who was lying in convulsions all the time.

Q. Was it a difficult case or an easy case?—A. It was a difficult case, but I did not think the woman deserved such treatment as that.

Q. What became of the woman; did she live?—A. No, sir; she died.

Q. How long after?—A. Some time that day or night, I think. This was between 12 and 1 o'clock when this took place.

Q. You proposed to tear the child to pieces and take it out?—

A. Yes, sir; cut it up. That is the practice. Then, with regard to the out-patients I spoke of, near about the time that the fiscal year 1877 ran out, they were coming there to the hospital, averaging between two and three hundred prescriptions during the month for patients, and near the end of the month Dr. Palmer said he would have to stop prescribing for any more patients, that it was too expensive, or something to that amount. I said, "Have you not got the medicines?" "Yes, we have the medicines sufficient, but," he said, "there is no appropriation made for medical attendance." I said to him that I would give my services there, if he and Dr. Purvis would also give a portion of their time, so as not to turn off these poor people. No provision had been made by the District government here for treating those people, and there were only a few places, one or two dispensaries in town where they could get medicine, and I thought it would be a great hardship to them, inasmuch as there were many cases very bad coming there daily, especially people living in the neighborhood—I thought it was a hardship on them that they could not get medicines. Dr. Palmer said, "No; we will close it up, and we can with better grace, then, go to Congress and ask for an increased appropriation next time."

Q. Were you discharged from the hospital at that time?—A. No, sir; I had not been discharged then.

Q. How soon after did you leave the hospital?—A. About the 1st day of July.

Q. It was at that time then that you were discharged; or did you resign?—A. No, sir; the appropriation made last year, I believe, cut down the medical attendants, as I understood, to only two.

Q. For that reason you were discharged?—A. Yes, sir; I was dropped from the rolls in consequence of that.

Q. Did you have any feeling against Dr. Palmer and Dr. Purvis because of your discharge?—A. No, sir; I had no feeling against them personally.

Q. Did you think they could have kept you on?—A. I did not suppose so at that time, because I understood that the appropriation would not admit it. I asked Dr. Palmer when I went in on the morning of the second of the month, Sunday being the first—I attended as usual, as I had not been dismissed—on Monday morning when I went, I found that Dr. Glennan had been through my ward. I then spoke to Dr. Palmer about it, and he said, "There is no appropriation to pay you." I said, "Is there any to pay Dr. Glennan?" He said, "Dr. Glennan is going to take the second place." Said I, "Dr. Purvis informs me he is going to take that place." He said, "No, Dr. Purvis, if he stays here, will have to get his pay the best way he can." That was the end of it, and I left. I understand that subsequently to that, Dr. Purvis was kept on, and was paid out of some fund, I do not know what.

Q. Did you thereupon apply for the situation of surgeon-in-chief?—A. Yes, sir; I applied for the place of surgeon-in-chief. I thought that, as there was going to be a change there—

Q. Whom did you apply to?—A. To the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. Was anything said about a change then of Dr. Palmer?—A. No, sir. There was nothing said about a change.

Q. You wished to apply because you understood there was going to be a change?—A. I supposed there might be a change.

Q. To whom did you apply?—A. I applied to the Secretary.

Q. What was your information? That there was no vacancy?—A. No vacancy.

Q. Did you then go to work to try to make a vacancy?—A. Petitions were sent in in my favor.

Q. Whom did you get to circulate such petitions?—A. I circulated one of them myself, and some of my friends, I do not recollect who now.

Q. Did you get the wife of O. S. B. Wall to circulate a petition?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you send a petition to her?—A. No, sir.

Q. You did not?—A. No, sir; some ladies got up a petition and interested Mrs. Wall, Mrs. Langston, and Mrs. Butler, and among the ladies they got up the petition, but I had nothing to do with it.

Q. Did you solicit Dr. Goerner to prefer charges against the institution?—A. I will tell you as far as Dr. Goerner is concerned—

Q. My question is, did you solicit him to prefer charges against the institution before your removal?—A. I did not directly. I might have done so indirectly. If you allow me, I will explain what I mean by "indirectly." Dr. Goerner stated to me that he wanted to get back in the institution. He came to my house and said that he thought we could manage it, and get into the hospital. I told him that I was working for myself. He said "Well, it's all right," but that he had also been trying to get in, and, I think, had written a letter to the Secretary, and I do not know whether the Secretary had answered it then or not. Anyhow, he seemed to have some encouragement that he would be taken back again. At any rate, he wanted me to go in with him, but I declined to do so. Subsequently to that he had a conversation with Captain Wall and several other persons, saying that he had information that he intended to put in the papers, and he told me that he was going to publish it in the paper called the Sunday Capital. However, I never saw that statement. I do not think it was ever made. I left town about that time, and just before I left Dr. Goerner wrote a letter to Captain Wall, giving certain statements against Dr. Palmer and the management of the hospital.

Q. He wanted to get Dr. Palmer's place?—A. No; I do not think he wanted to get Dr. Palmer's place. He wanted to get in the hospital again. He seemed to be in great distress.

Q. And you wanted to get Dr. Palmer's place?—A. I supposed I would have to get Dr. Palmer's place if I got in the hospital.

Q. Do you now hope this investigation will make a vacancy, so that you can get Dr. Palmer's place?—A. I made application for that very purpose—that if Dr. Palmer was removed, I should be appointed.

Q. And you now hope this investigation may be successful, in order that you may get the place?—A. I should like to have the place if the Secretary of the Interior should think proper to give me the appointment.

Q. Have you attended meetings at O. S. B. Wall's office, and at Calvert's house, in order to forward the investigation?—A. I have been there several times at *impromptu* meetings; met persons there and talked this matter over.

Q. What persons?—A. The gentleman sitting over there, Mr. McFarland, a gentleman named Adams—

Q. Mr. Wall?—A. Yes; Mr. Wall was there.

Q. Mr. Potter?—A. Potter, I think, was there on one or two occasions I recollect.

Q. Mr. Calvert?—A. I am not sure whether Mr. Calvert met us there or not.

Q. Did you meet at Calvert's house?—A. I have been at his house several times.

Q. On this business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been taking rather an active part in forwarding the investigation?—A. I have had nothing to do with starting the investigation, because at the time the investigation was started I was absent from the city.

Q. But in forwarding it—making it successful?—A. Yes; I sympathized with it very strongly.

Q. Because you wanted to get the place?—A. I suppose quite as much that as anything else; I should like to have the place; but I have another reason. I should like to see a change made, whether I get it or not. I have expressed myself freely, and do so now. I did not think that the management was in sympathy with the people who were in there, and I thought a change ought to be made, whether I got it or not.

Q. Were you once professor of anatomy in the medical department of Howard University?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you discharged from there?—A. I was not discharged.

Q. Did you resign?—A. I do not know whether you can call it a resignation or not. I will tell you the circumstances.

Q. Were your services dispensed with?—A. Yes, sir; my services were dispensed with, but in an irregular manner, I consider.

Q. Did you not blame Dr. Palmer for that, and feel rather sore over it?—A. Dr. Palmer and Dr. Purvis, I thought, engineered that matter, because I believe it was done thinking it would destroy any prospect I might have for being appointed surgeon in charge of the hospital, and I believe they acted against me in that respect, but this was long since. The investigation had commenced. It did not take place until some time in October; the first part of October or the last of September.

Q. If, as you say, you sympathized with those who have had these frequent meetings, with those persons who have met and caucused for the purpose of making it effectual, why did you say that you did not want to testify in this matter? Were you willing to do privately and underhand what you were unwilling to have appear on the record against you?—A. I will tell you why it was; because there was a good deal of one thing and another that had been said about the hospital—very disagreeable things that had been said—and I did not want to give my testimony.

Q. Did you keep your ward clean while you had charge there?—A. I tried to keep it clean.

Q. What ward was that?—A. I do not know what they call it now. It was the ward on the left-hand side of the buildings, facing towards Seventh street.

Q. Do you not remember the number?—A. No; I do not.

Q. Who was the nurse?—A. Chase was nurse in one ward, and a man named Hurd in the other.

Q. Were these two wards kept by Hurd and Chase, the nurses, clean

and in good order?—A. Measurably clean. I often spoke to them about it. I told them to keep them up to the mark.

Q. It was your duty to do that, was it?—A. It was my duty.

Q. And you attended to that duty?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you think they did it very well?—A. Yes; after I told them. That was one of the points I noticed in the inspection. After the inspection was over, I noticed a good deal of dirt upon different parts of the wards. I had had charge of hospitals; I was in the Army four years.

Q. It was your place to see that they kept them clean?—A. Yes, sir; certainly.

Q. And you did it?—A. Certainly.

Q. It was the place of Dr. Glennan, aside from inspection, to keep his clean?—A. I suppose so.

Q. And the place of Dr. Purvis, aside from inspection, to keep his clean?—A. I suppose so.

Q. And so of the other physicians?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you attended to that duty, and your ward was usually kept clean, was it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see that the beds were kept clean, and the floors?—A. Yes; I spoke to them often about it.

Q. Were you kind in your attention to patients?—A. I tried to be as kind as I possibly could.

Q. You saw that they had whatever they needed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is all.—A. I should like to state one thing in regard to a question you asked a while ago.

Q. You left there at what time in 1877?—A. The 2d of July was the last day I was there.

Q. Did you attend to this duty up to the time you left, as thoroughly as before, about keeping things clean in your wards?—A. Yes, sir; I did.

Q. So that up to the time you left in July there was no cause of complaint, as far as your two wards were concerned?—A. No, sir. Of course there were bad cases in those wards. Some of the men were very dirty, and it was difficult to keep them cleanly.

Q. They are a low class of patients, difficult to handle and keep clean?—A. Those in that ward especially, more so than in other wards.

Q. Is it not the custom of colored persons of the lower orders, we will say persons not accustomed, perhaps, to better things, to undervalue ventilation; and if you put up windows, to shut them down, and keep the air close, so that one of your duties was to see that the windows were opened frequently so as to keep up ventilation?—A. I have no doubt that is so in a great many cases.

Q. When you would go in and find the atmosphere bad, you would order the windows up?—A. Yes, sir; whenever I went in the ward I would smell this bad odor.

Q. You would go back and find the windows down, and order them up again, would you not?—A. Yes, sir. Now I will go on and state about Howard University if you wish.

Q. Certainly.—A. When I was acting as professor there, there was some disagreement about my teaching. On one occasion I was asked to change the position that I held, professor of anatomy, for that of materia medica, on the ground that I was too strict in some of my teachings and examinations. I was requested to take the chair of materia medica. I told a gentleman that I did not feel inclined to make a change of that kind; that I had been studying that branch and teaching it for a number of years; that I had begun to get rather old to take a new chair to teach,

and, therefore, I would prefer to remain where I was if I remained there; but in order not to embarrass the faculty, if they desired to make this change, I would leave the position I held at their disposal and they could get some one else to take the place and I would give it up, because, I said, for the same reason why I should change from anatomy to *materia medica* this year I might have to change from *materia medica* to some other chair next year.

Q. Was not the reason why they did not desire your services there because they did not consider you a good lecturer, able to explain your subjects; was not that the reason?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you not take offense at that reason?—A. No, sir; I am coming to that if you will let me.

Q. Certainly; I only direct your attention to it.—A. I am coming to it. At this time I speak of there was no complaint about me that I did not properly teach; but there were some students who would not study anatomy, and I insisted that they should study anatomy as long as I was there. I did not think any man fit to go out to practice medicine and surgery unless he studied anatomy. I had been taught to study that branch thoroughly where I was taught, and I believed it my duty to all those whom I had to teach to teach them in the same way. There were some students, as there will be in almost all colleges, who did not like to study anatomy, and in this case there were quite a number, but there were others who were very diligent students, studied well, and are now in practice and good practitioners, I believe, from what I have heard from them, who studied anatomy and learned it there. These gentlemen declined to take my place when I offered it to them, and the matter dropped there. During last year the question came up again as to my being changed to *materia medica* from anatomy, and at the meeting in which the matter was brought up I asked the gentlemen what were the charges against me? They said they wanted to transfer me to another chair. I said, "What are your charges against me?" "Well," said Professor Purvis, "there are no charges against you particularly, but the matter has been talked over before. The students say your memory is defective; your articulation is bad," and another remark that I cannot think of just at this moment. I said, "I am willing to lecture here in the same position I have always lectured, but if I cannot do justice to the chair I have been lecturing in now for about eight years, I do not see that I could take a new place with only about three weeks' preparation and do justice to it; therefore I do not think it is just now to change me." I felt satisfied that the action against me was because at the time I had become an applicant for the position of surgeon in charge of the hospital; and it was for that reason that they asked me to change, knowing that I would not change. I had said I would not do so.

Q. You think injustice was done you in that matter by Dr. Palmer and Dr. Purvis, do you?—A. Yes, sir; but my application for surgeon in charge of the hospital was made since the 30th of June, or the first part of July, the 4th or 5th, and this took place in September. I have no doubt these gentlemen hurried this matter up and brought another reason.

Q. Do you think the students did not complain that your utterance was defective, and your memory not good?—A. I have no doubt there might have been two or three, but I have got evidence from plenty of them that that is incorrect. It is not so.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Are you a practicing physician in this city?—A. I am. I was a

surgeon in the Army four years, and since I left the Army I have been practicing in the city, and between eight and nine years I have been connected with the medical department of Howard University, as demonstrator one session, and subsequent to that, professor of anatomy up to last September, and the reason why I stated just now. I cannot say I was dismissed. These gentlemen passed a resolution, the medical department requesting the executive committee to make the change. The board of trustees, meeting only at stated periods, when this special meeting was called, it seems the executive committee had to transact the matters. I entered a protest that day against the action of the medical faculty in my case, and wrote a letter to the executive committee, explaining why I did not think justice had been done me, and why I did not think I ought to be changed. However, after the meeting, and conversation with me, they concluded to confirm the action. I appealed from their action, to the board of trustees, and have not yet been able to lay my case before the board of trustees.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. How old are you?—A. I was 53 on the 6th day of this month.

Q. Where did you study medicine?—A. I commenced to study medicine in Philadelphia.

Q. At what school?—A. I did not attend any school there. They would not admit me to any school there, but I was a student of medicine under Professor Henry Gibbons, whom I presume you know something about, as you have been in California, and he was a gentleman practicing medicine in San Francisco.

Q. Did he have a school?—A. No, sir; he was professor in the Philadelphia College of Medicine.

Q. Did you ever study at any school or college?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What one?—A. I studied at Trinity Medical College, Toronto, Canada West, and graduated there.

Q. When was that?—A. In the session of 1855-'56, I think. I practiced in Toronto subsequent to that; went to the West Indies, Port Au Prince, practiced there a short time, returned to Canada, and on my return I wrote to Mr. Stanton and President Lincoln asking for a commission in the Army. I was told to come to Washington here and be examined. I was examined by the board of examiners who at first refused to examine me, but were compelled to do so by a peremptory order from the Secretary of War that I must be examined.

Q. Were you born in Philadelphia?—A. No, sir; I was born in Norfolk, Virginia.

Q. What age were you when you went to Philadelphia?—A. I was about twenty-two.

Q. What time did you go to Canada?—A. I went to Canada in 1853. I studied medicine in Philadelphia, and finding that I could not get in college there, and had not the means to go to any other place, I went to California, worked there in the mines and at one thing and another until I accumulated enough means, and then came back and went to Canada and into college there.

Q. Where were you in California?—A. I was up at Nevada.

Q. Nevada City?—A. Nevada City they called it, I think.

Q. How long were you there?—A. Perhaps four or five months, perhaps not as long.

Q. Whom do you know in Nevada City?—A. I do not know anybody there now.

Q. Whom did you know then?—A. I do not know that I can recollect

any person I knew there. It was 1851 when I was there. I do not know that I can recollect any person who was there at that time. I subsequently came to Hangtown, otherwise called Placerville, and remained there a certain length of time, and knew several gentlemen there.

Q. Whom did you know there?—A. A Mr. Bee there; Mr. Springer, a gentleman who published a paper there. I knew several gentlemen there I have a letter somewhere home now from Mr. Springer, who I have since learned is dead.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. How long were you professor of anatomy in the medical department of Howard University?—A. From 1869 until 1877.

Q. Where are the rooms of the professor of anatomy?—A. I had three different rooms.

Q. Where is the dissecting done?—A. The dissecting was done in the upper part of the building.

Q. What building?—A. Above the floor where the lecture-room is.

Q. What building?—A. The brick building.

Q. What brick building?—A. The brick building where the medical-college lectures are held.

Q. Nowhere near the hospital?—A. Yes, sir, very near the hospital.

Q. How near?—A. I suppose about thirty feet.

Q. Is it in the brick building where the office is?—A. Yes, sir, at the top of that building.

Q. Did you have an assistant professor?—A. No, sir.

Q. The dissecting-rooms are on the upper floor of the building adjacent to the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How large are those rooms?—A. They differ. Some of them are from about twelve to twenty feet, I should judge.

Q. Had you charge of them as professor?—A. No, sir; the demonstrators of anatomy had charge of those rooms.

Q. Was he not under your guidance?—A. Only to a certain extent. They seemed to differ in that college in regard to these matters from other colleges I have attended. They do not seem to think that the professor of anatomy should have anything to do with overseeing anything of the demonstrator of anatomy.

Q. Who was the demonstrator of anatomy?—A. We had several while I was there; Dr. Borland was the last one there.

Q. As professor of anatomy, you had general charge of the dissecting-room, of course?—A. No.

Q. Did you never appear in the dissecting-room?—A. I used to go up and inspect them and look after them at times.

Q. Was there always great care taken that everything was done in decency and order relative to the management of those bodies furnished for dissection? Was there any trouble about that in any way that you ever noticed?—A. There was not much. Sometimes the offal would accumulate in the room, and I would find it necessary to go out to the man who cleaned it up, or to send for him.

Q. Sometimes students would be careless, you mean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But whenever any such thing appeared you always took care to cure the evil and correct the difficulty, whatever there was?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What did you use to have done with the offal?—A. I did not have anything done with it. There was a man there by the name of Banks, whom Dr. Palmer designated to clean up things.

Q. That was his duty, and not yours?—A. Not mine. I never knew what he did with it. I understand he buried the bodies, but did not know where.

Q. That you know nothing about?—A. No.

SIDNEY MCFARLAND (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Your name has been given to us by those who promote this investigation as one who is able to tell of your own knowledge some matters with reference to the Freedmen's Hospital. Are you able to do so? Do you know anything about it of your own knowledge?—A. I do not know anything about the inner workings of the institution to my personal knowledge.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am an employé of the United States jail.

Q. Are you connected with the hospital in any way?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or with Howard University?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever been?—A. No, sir.

Q. You know nothing about it of your own knowledge?—A. Not of the inner workings of it. I only know about the same as Mr. Crusoe knows about it.

Q. What do you mean?—A. I mean to say that he was not connected there with the institution, nor me either. He was a friend of Dr. Purvis, and I am a friend of O. S. B. Wall, who is said to have instituted this investigation. His statement was to the effect that O. S. B. Wall instituted this investigation. I am here to say that he did not.

Q. Do you know who did?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know it?—A. Well, sir, I know it because it was shown to me before it was shown to the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. By whom?—A. Robert Johnson.

Q. Do you know whether it was shown to Mr. Wall or not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know?—A. I went in with Robert Johnson and showed it to him.

Q. That was before it was shown to the Secretary of the Interior?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I understood Mr. Wall to say he did not know anything about it until after the investigation was commenced; I may be mistaken, but his testimony, of course, is in the record. You think, if he so testified, that his recollection is not so good as yours in the matter?—A. I called his attention to it in time.

Q. Whom else was it shown to?—A. There was another gentleman in there; I cannot call his name.

Q. Was he one of the patients?—A. No, sir; a gentleman who happened to be in the office at the time.

Q. Was he consulted in reference to it, or did he only happen to be there?—A. He happened to be there. He was consulted the same as Mr. Wall and myself.

Q. What is the business of that person?—A. I do not know. I think he is a carpenter.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. What is his name?—A. I do not know what his name is. He happened just to be in there at the time and he sympathized with it, as we all did.

Q. Why did you sympathize with it?—A. I sympathized with it be-

cause I understood that there was some ill-treatment of the colored patients by Dr. Purvis, and I wanted to know whether this was true. That is all. That is the interest I have taken in it. I have only taken this interest all the way through when the committee was appointed.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Did Mr. Wall also take an interest in it all along?—A. Yes, sir; I believe he has taken the same interest in it I did precisely.

Q. You are a friend of Mr. Wall, and speak of your own knowledge in reference to these things?—A. Yes, sir. I want to speak, because it has been stated here that O. S. B. Wall was the originator of the investigation; that he was running it for self-interest and self-purposes.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. And you know that is not so?—A. I know it is not so.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. You know that because the charges were shown to you and him, and you and he were consulted before they were shown to the Secretary of the Interior?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know nothing of the affairs of the hospital?—A. I do not know anything about the affairs of the institution.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. How long have you known Robert Johnson?—A. I knew him for about seven or eight years.

Q. Where did he show you these charges?—A. He was on his way going to the Secretary of the Interior at the time.

Q. Where were you?—A. I was standing in the middle of the street.

Q. Did he call you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he say to you?—A. He had been making some complaints about Dr. Purvis's treatment to me before that, and some few days before that said he was almost afraid to stay there on some political reasons; that Dr. Purvis had stated to him, "I have got you now," or "I will fix you," and I told him that I guessed that did not amount to anything; he was only funning with him. Then he said to me the next time he saw me—he saw me twice before the charges——

Q. I do not care about going into those times. You were in the street, and he called you and pulled out these charges and exhibited them to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember about where that was?—A. It was on Seventh street, a few doors the other side of the boundary.

Q. Was that near Wall's place?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Wall with you?—A. No, sir.

Q. How do you know he showed them to Wall?—A. I went there to the door with him.

Q. Then you and he went together to Wall's place?—A. Yes, sir. I asked him if he could have these charges sustained, and he said he could.

Q. Then did you say, "Let us go and see Wall," or did he say it?—A. I said, "Let me go and show these to Wall," and then he read them himself.

Q. To Wall?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did Wall say?—A. Wall said, "Well, those are pretty bad; do you think he can sustain them?" He said, "Yes, and more, too."

Q. You do not know whether or not that was the first time that John-

son had seen Wall, do you?—A. I do not know of my own personal knowledge; no, sir.

Q. He may have seen Wall before?—A. He may have seen him, but if he had he would have been likely to tell me.

Q. You know Wall?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he knew Wall, of course?—A. Yes, sir; I think he did.

Q. You do not know but that he may have seen Wall before, do you?—A. It might be likely he might have seen him before; but it is likely he would have told me if he had, because I called his attention when he read them over to me in the street. I said, "Let us go and see if Wall is in, and let us show them to him." He said he had to be down to the Secretary at such a time.

Q. Why did you suggest Wall?—A. Wall was a particular friend of mine and I wanted to see what he would say about them, if he would say anything about them. I wanted to show what charges Johnson preferred that he said he could sustain.

Q. You and Wall had never had any conversation about this hospital before?—A. We have had conversation about the hospital. I spoke to him once about the treatment there, and asked him if it was true that Dr. Purvis was treating the people in there that way.

Q. What did he say to that?—A. He said he did not know. He had heard so himself.

Q. Then you had talked with Wall before about these things?—A. Yes, sir; I talked with Wall and talked to a number of other people about them.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You had talked to Wall before you had the interview with Johnson?—A. In regard to these charges do you mean?

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. In regard to the hospital?—A. That was a frequent talk, not in connection with this, for I never knew there were any charges coming up.

Q. I did not ask you about charges. I asked if you talked with Wall about the hospital before you had this talk with Johnson?—A. O, yes, sir; for a couple of years.

Q. Were these complaints so old as that?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Two years before that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is three years ago nearly.

Mr. ALLISON. Two years before August last.

Mr. EATON. Three years next summer.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. And you say you had talked to Wall. What did he say to you on those occasions?—A. He said he had heard the same himself, that people there had been treated rather inhuman.

Q. That is as long ago as two years since and more?—A. Between one and two years. I will say two years ago.

Q. Then you thought Wall would be interested, perhaps, in looking over these charges. That I suppose is the reason you suggested to Johnson to go and show them to him?—A. I thought any colored people ought to be interested in it when it came against colored men who were in there.

Q. And therefore you thought Wall would be?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is Dr. Purvis a colored man?—A. Yes, sir; I guess he is. He ought to be.

Q. Are you a friend of Dr. Purvis?—A. Yes, sir; I am.

Q. A friend of every colored man?—A. Every respectable colored man I am a friend of, in general.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Are you a friend of Robert Johnson?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I am a friend of him in particular. I know him well.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Why are you not a friend of his?—A. Well, I can say that I am a friend to him, too.

Q. Are you, or are you not?—A. Yes, sir; I am a friend of his.

Q. Do you consider him a respectable colored man—a good man?—A. Yes, sir; by his recommendations. I am not much acquainted with him, but I know he has got recommendations. He has good recommendations from Governor Shepherd, for instance.

Q. Does Governor Shepherd think him a good man?—A. According to his letter of recommendation.

Q. What was the date of that recommendation?—A. It has been two or three years old; I did not look at the date of it. I was looking at his letters when he was going to the Secretary.

Q. They recommended him as a respectable, good man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your own knowledge of him?—A. I have not seen anything—

Q. Do you know of his being arrested for keeping a house of ill-fame?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never heard of that?—A. I read in the paper the name of Robert Johnson; I did not know whether it was him or not. I have heard since it was him.

Q. Is that respectable?—A. Well, not for keeping a house of ill-fame. I believe he was arrested in a house of ill-fame.

Q. Is that respectable?—A. No, sir; it is not respectable, but there are very many who get arrested there.

Q. Do you know anything of his being arrested on the charge of receiving stolen goods?—A. I have heard of that.

Q. Is that respectable?—A. If a man received stolen goods, or stole them and was convicted, I should say it was disrespectful, but we have a great many arrested and kept in jail there like Senator Sawyer, and a number of others, who turn out not to be guilty.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You make this distinction: he was unfortunate in being charged, and if he was convicted it would be disreputable?—A. That is what I meant to get at.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. If he was an innocent man, of course it ought not to injure him?—A. That is what I think. I think he must have been innocent, or he would certainly have been convicted.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Do you think that is certain? The detective swore before us that the goods were found in his possession and identified.—A. Then it is singular they did not convict him.

Q. Without saying whether they convicted him or not, I want to know whether you are acquainted with the character of the man.—A. I am not acquainted with him particularly.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You spoke about, after having an interview with Mr. Robert Johnson, having gone to see Captain Wall; did you have interviews also with Calvert, the engineer?—A. Yes, sir; I have had since that time.

Q. Where were those interviews?—A. One was at his house; one was at my house, and one was at—

Q. Somewhere else; I am not particular as to the place. Did you not have more than three interviews with reference to the investigation?—A. You speak of Calvert. That is all I have had with him.

Q. Did they have reference to the business of the previous investigation?—A. Yes, sir; talking over that matter.

Q. In respect to the charges that Johnson made?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who were with you at the times, the three occasions you saw Calvert? Take the first time.—A. The first time Mr. Wall, Mr. Adams, and, I think, Dr. Augusta.

Q. Was Johnson present?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who at the second interview or meeting?—A. Calvert first, and the time that they removed this Potter from the hospital, he was there to get a place to sleep, and Mr. Adams, I think, was there. That was the second one.

Q. Anybody else but yourself, Calvert, Adams, and Potter?—A. No.

Q. Who were present at the third interview?—A. At the third Mr. Calvert, Potter, O. S. B. Wall, Adams, and another strange gentleman, I do not know his name.

Q. Those were the interviews that you had when Calvert was present. Did you have various other interviews in which this matter was discussed when Captain Wall and Dr. Augusta were present, when Calvert was not there?—A. Yes, sir; it was the day going up to see the Secretary we had the interview.

RODMAN BANES sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Where do you reside?—A. I live at Claysville, Montgomery County, Maryland, near the post-town of Colesville.

Q. Were you ever an inmate of the Freedman's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From what time to what time?—A. From the 21st of last August until about the middle of October, as near as I can remember. I cannot remember as to the date I left exactly.

Q. Were you there sick?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the matter with you?—A. I had the chills and fever, contracted nearly two years previous. Dr. Purvis told me that I had the intermittent fever. I presume so. I do not know myself of my own knowledge.

Q. You were pretty sick?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ward were you in?—A. Number 2.

Q. That was the one in which Felton is, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the condition of the ward as to cleanliness?—A. It was good, under the circumstances.

Q. What was the condition of the floors, the bedding, &c.?—A. Clean.

Q. What was the treatment of the patients by Dr. Purvis, kindly or otherwise?—A. I think kindly, always. I never saw anything else but

kindness toward them. In many cases I thought there was more kindness shown than some of the patients really deserved.

Q. Why so?—A. From the fact that they did not appreciate the kindness that was extended to them.

Q. How would they show a want of appreciation of it?—A. They signified as much as he did not give them what they wanted in the way of food. I heard one of them on one occasion complain that he did not get the kind of medicine that he wanted, he himself, not Doctor Purvis, but he himself wanted a certain kind of medicine and that Doctor Purvis would not furnish it to him.

Q. The doctor prescribed for him the medicine that he thought was necessary for him, did he?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he got what the doctor prescribed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He did not complain that he did not get the medicine that the doctor prescribed for him?—A. O, no.

Q. You say that some of them complained that they did not have the food that was proper for them?—A. The food that they wanted.

Q. What food did they get?—A. Such as the doctor ordered for them. It was what I got myself, the same as other patients got.

Q. Was it good food that you got?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it well cooked?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And clean?—A. Clean.

Q. Did you have enough?—A. Plenty. If there was not enough came on the plate when it was first handed to me, I had only to ask for more and it was always given me.

Q. Were the other patients treated in the same way?—A. I think so. I never saw anything to the contrary.

Q. Have you known other patients to ask for more and receive it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you on any occasion examine some fish or meat after Mr. Felton said it was spoiled?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Just relate how that was?—A. We had boiled mackerel for breakfast. I remarked to a patient lying within two beds of me that those were good mackerel, and he replied they were very good. While we were in conversation upon the subject, I heard Felton say to Sanders, the nurse, that he could not eat stinking fish; that these fish were not fit to eat; they were rotten. I immediately got up from the table where I was sitting eating my breakfast, and took my own fork and went to the plate that was held by Lucius, the chief nurse, and I asked him if that was the fish that Felton had had. He said yes. I took my own fork that I had been eating with and tasted it, and it was as good as the fish that I ate for my breakfast. It was good enough, I considered for anybody.

Q. Was Mr. Felton accustomed to complain?—A. Yes, sir; he was about the only person that made any complaint of treatment of any kind in the ward during my stay there as a patient.

Q. Were you there during the time that the committee from the Interior Department was investigating?—A. I think I was there when they commenced the investigation. If my memory serves me right, I went away before I was called to give my testimony before that committee.

Q. Who managed, while you were there, the investigation before that committee against Dr. Palmer?—A. Mr. Felton.

Q. What was his method of doing it, so far as the witnesses were concerned?—A. In the capacity of a lawyer.

Q. When the committee were not there, what was his course in reference to the persons?—A. He was endeavoring to ascertain the names

of persons who would testify against the hospital and its government, and finding out what he could get persons to say as evidence against Dr. Palmer and the general management of the hospital.

Q. Would he take what they would say with reference to it, or would he inform them about it?—A. He would sometimes. On one or two occasions he put his own construction for them to say. Upon one occasion particularly, that I wish to mention, he said to Henry Sanders, the nurse in ward No. 2, to tell Henry, the chief nurse in the lower ward, No. 1, Dr. Glennan's ward, that if he did not go before that committee and testify that them fish was not good he would have him turned out of employment.

Q. Did Mr. Felton use any profane language in your presence?—A. I have heard him use profane language.

Q. To whom?—A. To a man by the name of Potter.

Q. On what occasion was that?—A. That was while I was a patient in the hospital; I think it was some time before the previous investigation commenced. It was a matter, as near as I can remember, I suppose it might be considered political; Potter being an Englishman and he an American, they differed upon a subject of revenue in regard to the two governments, and they came to high words.

Q. Did any blows pass between them?—A. No, sir; there were no blows passed, but Felton raised his cane, his iron cane that he uses, and was about to strike Potter, but did not do it.

Q. Why did he not do it?—A. I do not know why he did not do it. I am not prepared to say. I was lying in my bed, and happened accidentally to see it.

Q. What did Potter do or say?—A. Potter talked, but what he said now I am not able to remember. He told him not to strike him, though, I remember that; that he had better not do it, or words to that effect.

Q. Do you remember any other occasion of his using profane language?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I do. He sometimes was rough in some of his expressions, but it was not noticeable on my part.

Q. Did you at any time have a conversation with Calvert about the plumbing of the water-closets?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was that, and what was it?—A. That was in the boiler-house. He told me that the doctors had reduced his salary, and that he had agreed when he made his contract with the doctors, or with whoever it was that he did make the contract with (I am not able to say who that was now, for my memory does not serve me), that he was to have \$90 a month, and he was to attend to the boilers and the engine and pumping, whatever it may be termed, and he was to do the plumbing; that the doctors had reduced his wages, and he was not going to do the plumbing. Hence the bad condition of the water-closets at the time of which Mr. Felton gives his testimony before you a few days ago of their being so filthy.

Q. Calvert let them get out of order?—A. Yes, sir; Calvert let them get out of order. He said he would not attend to the steam arrangements and do the plumbing both on his reduced wages.

Q. Did he speak particularly about the water-closets?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is all.—A. I would like to make a statement in regard to evidence I saw published in the Star of the day before yesterday, in regard to a matter of Dr. Purvis and Dr. Palmer being given to cursing. I wish to say that I have known Dr. Purvis since he was a little boy and wore aprons, and I have yet for the first time to ever hear a bad word out of his mouth. I have never heard a bad word out of Dr. Palmer's mouth, and my acquaintance with him has been from the time I first was taken as a patient to the hospital up to the present time.

COLLINS CRUSOR (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Do you know O. S. B. Wall?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Wall, in his testimony, refers to you, stating that you came to him on behalf of Dr. Purvis, and said you were authorized to say to him, and would bring to him in writing, anything that was necessary to induce him not to proceed against Purvis. Did you have such conversation with him?—A. I most positively state here under oath that I have never stated to O. S. B. Wall that Dr. Purvis ever authorized me, under any conditions whatever, to make any overtures to O. S. B. Wall to stop the investigation.

Q. Did Dr. Purvis make any such overtures?—A. None at all to me.

Q. And you made no such representations to Wall?—A. No, sir; I never breathed Dr. Purvis's name to him in relation to any overtures whatever.

Q. What did you say to him about Dr. Purvis, if anything?—A. I was chairman of a club that Dr. Purvis, Professor Langston, O. S. B. Wall, Charles H. Peters, and myself and several others belong to. During this investigation, or just about the time of entering upon the investigation, I felt it my duty to see Wall and to see Dr. Purvis to see if we could not harmonize the matter by some means or other. I went to Wall and said to him that I would like to have this matter settled; that I thought it was a piece of persecution on his part; and that with others I was satisfied there was no truth in what he and others had stated concerning Dr. Purvis's figure in the hospital in the discharge of his duties, &c. I said to him, "For God's sake, stop this thing and let us see if we cannot harmonize it, if it is patronage you are after." I have no doubt I might have said, "I am satisfied you can get it"; but as for using Dr. Purvis's name, or saying to him that Dr. Purvis or Dr. Palmer had authorized me in any shape or form to make any overtures, I most positively swear I never used such words to O. S. B. Wall.

Q. Did Wall say anything to you as to his intentions about the hospital?—A. Yes, sir; he stated to me that he intended to rout out Dr. Palmer if possible. The language he used was "the oid Yankee scoundrel."

Q. What reason did he give?—A. He gave me the reason that he had worked to get out Dr. Reyburn and worked to get Dr. Palmer in there, and Dr. Palmer failed to give him the patronage, and he was dissatisfied with Dr. Palmer because he did this. He said that he gave him the milk, that it was a mere matter of nothing, and that he had taken it from him, and he intended to do all he could to get Dr. Palmer out of there.

I will further state, if the committee will suffer me, that I saw Mr. O. S. B. Wall and said to him, in relation to Dr. Augusta, that he was never very favorably impressed with Dr. Augusta, and I did not see why he had recommended him for the position that Dr. Palmer has as chief of the hospital. He said to me, "Mr. Crusor, I have only put him up as a figure-head to start this thing with." "Well," said I, "Mr. Wall, that is a very wrong way, I think, of treating Dr. Augusta in that light. However, it does not matter," said I; "I think if anybody is entitled to the office, and Dr. Palmer should get out of the way, Dr. Purvis ought to have it, from the fact of his having been in the place for some eight or ten years or more." I said no more to O. S. B. Wall in relation to the matter either *pro* or *con*.

I would further state, if the committee would suffer me, that Mr.

Sidney McFarland, who was a few days ago before this committee, came to me at the jail and requested me, and insisted upon me seeing Dr. Purvis, to see if he would meet Mr. Wall, myself, him, and one or two others, to try, if possible, to harmonize this matter. I told Mr. McFarland that I was glad to hear they were willing to try to settle this thing, and I wanted to know from him whether he had seen O. S. B. Wall, and whether Mr. Wall had requested him to come to me to see Dr. Purvis to get him to meet him. He said he had just left Mr. O. S. B. Wall's, and such was the fact; that he had authorized him so to say. I said, "Mr. McFarland, you have been holding many caucuses at different places. This thing looks to me as if a conspiracy." "Yes," said he; "we have been holding a good many meetings, and we had a man at the head of this matter" (who was Dr. Augusta) "who was not liberal enough in spending his money;" and he added that he had got tired of this thing, and he found there was nothing in it, and had given the thing entirely up and would let it fall through.

I went to Dr. Purvis according to his request. I said to Dr. Purvis, "Mr. McFarland has come to me to ask you to meet Mr. Wall and try and harmonize this matter if we possibly can." Said he, "Sir, I would not meet that scoundrel on no conditions, unless he would go to the Secretary of the Interior and take back the falsehoods he has stated there against this hospital." Said I, "Doctor, that is a very hard thing for you to ask. I reckon he would hardly do that, but I judge Wall will do almost anything else save that, and he would like to have the matter harmonized if possible." Said he, "Crusor, he is a rascal, and you will find him out before long." I left Dr. Purvis, and have had nothing to say concerning the hospital since then.

That is all I have to say. Any other questions you desire to propound to me that I can think over, I shall be glad to answer. There are other matters on the outside of that connected with the Children's Hospital, that Mrs. Heacock has charge of, that Mr. Wall said something to me about.

Q. Did he say anything in reference to the patronage of that other hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he say?—A. He said he called on Mrs. Heacock to consult her about the milk; that they had taken it away from him and given it to his brother; Al. Wall, I think his name is. I am not acquainted with the gentleman. He said that they had taken it away without any cause whatever, and he intended to be even with that hospital, to use his best efforts to break that hospital up, because they had simply taken the milk from him. Said I, "Wall, that is a pretty heavy thing you have on hand, fights all around the carpet." "I don't care," said he; "I am going into it; I am going to fight this thing out. These Yankee scoundrels shall not have the patronage down here to do as they please with." I have not met Mr. Wall since.

Q. Do you know the date of the conversation wherein he said he intended to get Dr. Palmer out?—A. I cannot recollect the date.

Q. Can you recollect the date in reference to the investigation carried on by the Interior Department?—A. I cannot, because I took no notice. I had no idea I would be called in question concerning it.

Q. You cannot tell whether it was in August or September last?—A. I cannot. I ought to state here, gentlemen, that I never held five minutes' conversation nor one moment's conversation with Dr. Palmer concerning the investigation, either *pro* or *con*, nor have I ever called the name of Mr. Wall to Dr. Palmer or Dr. Palmer to him. I have simply had an introduction to Dr. Palmer; that is about all.

GEORGE CHAPMAN (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. You are the steward of the Freedmen's Hospital?—Answer.—Yes, sir.

Q. Something has been said here in reference to affidavits prepared by Mr. Felton, and sworn to by witnesses. Was such an affidavit prepared for you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the affidavit written out in your presence, or prepared for you to sign?—A. It was written out in my absence and brought to me to sign.

Q. Did you sign it or decline to sign it?—A. I declined.

Q. Had he consulted you as to what you knew before writing out that affidavit?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why did you decline?—A. The reason why I declined was because when I happened to go in the ward where he was, and Mr. Robert Johnson showed me the affidavit that he wanted me to swear to, there were some things in it that I did not care to have anything to do with. In fact, I did not know the nature of the affidavit any way. He wanted me to swear to it and I told him I could not swear to those things.

Q. They were things you did not know to be true?—A. No; I did not know anything about them.

Q. Was it Johnson or Felton?—A. Robert Johnson.

Q. Who prepared the affidavit? Do you know?—A. I do not know who prepared it, but Johnson was the one that presented it to me.

Q. You did not know whether it was prepared by Felton or not?—A. I did not.

Q. Did you have any talk with Dr. Augusta in reference to going before the committee as a witness?—A. No, sir.

Q. At any time?—A. I did not have any talk directly with him about that. He spoke to me once and said that he expected they would want me down before the committee. That was the time that the first investigation was going on, and he said if I was called down there he would stand by me while I was there. That was all the conversation.

Q. What did you understand him to mean by saying that he would stand by you while you were there?—A. I hardly knew what he meant by that, but he said he expected they would call me before the committee, and if they did so he would stand by me while I was there.

Q. Were you afraid to go?—A. O, no, sir.

Q. Did you need any assurance of being supported while there?—A. No, sir; I do not think I did.

Q. Did you have any fear of losing your place if you went there?—A. No, sir. I never entertained any fear of that since the investigation has been going on.

Q. You have stated what you thought to be true without reference to how it might affect you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did Captain Wall say anything to you of that nature?—A. 'Squire Wall has talked with me about it. I live pretty close to him, and I would sometimes meet him, and we would talk sometimes in reference to the investigation, but I do not think he said anything directly to me about it.

Q. Did Potter say anything to you, or in your presence, with reference to anything that would stop the investigation?—A. He did once, when the investigation first commenced; he came into the commissary where I was, and said he thought Dr. Palmer, and among them were

mighty big blockheads, that they did not offer some sum—he did not say any particular sum—of money to get Mr. Riddle to go to Felton and offer something to him.

GEORGE GRAY (colored), recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Do you know anything about affidavits being prepared to be signed by persons in the hospital to be submitted to the Interior Department?—Answer. No, sir; no more than what I have heard.

Q. Do you know of an affidavit being prepared for yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. There was no affidavit prepared for you?—A. Well, I suppose there was one prepared when the investigation first commenced. When they summoned me to go before the committee at the hospital, I heard that and went to see Mr. Felton, and he read that to me, and I told him that I would not answer in that way.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. He read what to you?—A. An affidavit that he had prepared; and I refused to answer that way.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Why did you refuse to swear to the contents of it?—A. Because he had it fixed up in a way that I did not know anything about it, and I told him I would not swear to anything I did not know about.

WILLIAM H. HOOVER, recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. When Mr. O. S. B. Wall was on the stand the other day, his attention was directed to a question, whether he had had a conversation with you at the Interior Department, in which something was said with reference to the patronage of the Freedmen's Hospital. Did any such conversation take place?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. What was that conversation?—A. I met 'Squire Wall in the halls of the Interior Department as I was going to draw my monthly pay, and he said, "Hoover, are you still furnishing meat to the hospital?" I said, "Yes." He said, "It will be soon time to make a new contract, and I wish you to come and see me before that time." I asked him was he the superintendent of the hospital. He said no; but that he had worked hard to get Dr. Reyburn removed, and Dr. Palmer put in his place, and he expected to derive his pay for his trouble from the patronage of the hospital. I told him I did not think Dr. Palmer was that kind of a man. I said also that I was furnishing the meat so low that there was no chance for any dividing about it. He said he could add a cent or so a pound to that. I told him I would not consent to anything of the kind; that I would see Dr. Palmer; and then he begged me not to say anything to Dr. Palmer about it. I told him I was not going to place myself in the hands of any colored man as my owner; I never owned a colored man in my life, and I would not own one, or suffer one to own me.

Q. Where was that conversation?—A. In the hall of the Interior Department, right outside Dr. Joseph's office. I think the office is on the second floor, and this was in the hall. I think he was going to get his pay at the same time, and I happened to meet him.

Q. When did that conversation take place?—A. About two years ago.

Q. Do you furnish meat to any other institutions than the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ones?—A. I furnish the Reform School with their meat; I have furnished the Reform School for two years.

Q. Do you furnish that school the same kind of meat that you do to the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I do; if anything, the meat that goes to the Freedmen's Hospital is of a little better quality, because the boys at the Reform School complain about fat meat. They like the fleshier pieces. I furnish to the Freedmen's Hospital, and have for the last five years, better meat than the Army has ever received. I am furnishing at present the United States Army and the officers of the Army.

Q. Do you do that under contract?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you do a large trade?—A. Yes, sir.

CHARLES H. PETERS (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Washington.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a guard at the United States jail.

Q. Do you know O. S. B. Wall?—A. I do.

Q. Have you ever had any conversation with Mr. Wall in reference to the control of the patronage of the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; once.

Q. What was that conversation?—A. I think it was about the 4th or 5th of January. I think it was after the committee appointed by the Secretary of the Interior had investigated the hospital and they had reported in its favor and acquitted the officers of all the charges against them. I thought it was so, but I did not say so to Mr. Wall. I was interested in one case and I wanted to have it made correct. I had some knowledge of it. Dr. Purvis and Wall were friends; we were all friends, and I had understood from Wall's brother that the captain had been after him stating that Purvis had done all he could to work against him in an appointment, which I knew was false, and I wanted to correct that statement. I called at Captain Wall's office and I stated to him, "You are misinformed about that; it is not so; the doctor did nothing to prevent your brother from getting this position; I know he did not, and I can tell you who did work against him." That led on to the investigation. I had never said anything of it before, because I did not know anything about the outside or inside workings of the institution. We were friends, and I did not care to mix up with it. Said I, "What is the matter, anyhow, Cap.? you have been friends; I hate to see friends quarreling." He said he had been badly treated; he had worked hard, and they had lost their man. He thought his services were entitled to consideration, anyhow; that he had had some patronage, but that Palmer had pressed him down, and finally had taken it away from him. Said I, "I have heard something about it; but, Cap., I heard that you were charging fabulous and extraordinary prices for your goods, and then they were inferior. If that be the case I cannot blame him." I heard they wrote a letter to him. "Well," said he, "they have written me a letter; I will tell you what I did, Charley; I would take my wagon and go down to the commissioner's and buy potatoes and things as cheap as I could; I had to make a profit on them; but he screwed me down to the lowest notch, and then said the goods

were not good, &c., and," said he, "I know they were as good as any he had bought in the place." "Well," said I, "the doctor has nothing to do with that; what are you after the doctor for?" "Well," said he, "I am not after Charley; I am after Palmer; if Charley gets in the way he must receive the knocks."

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Who is Charley?—A. Dr. Purvis. "But," said I, "you seem to be after the doctor as much as Palmer from what I understand." "No," said he, "I am not after him, but if he has put himself in the way he will receive the knocks, and if this committee do not give us an investigation favorable, I am going to Congress; I am going to have that institution broken up. They have missed their man. I am not going to work for anybody for nothing." So I left him and said, "I would like to see you and the doctor make this thing up." He said, "Well, I have nothing against Purvis." Said I, "Yes, but you have something against him, Cap.; we have met here and been friends and I do not see why you cannot be friends again. I am sure Charley Purvis does everything to assist you and your brother. Your brother is now furnishing milk at the hospital." "Well," said he, "I had a little milk bill and they even took that away from me because I sublet it to somebody, or something of that kind, or the milk was not good; they complained about everything." I left and said, "Never mind, I am going to get you and Purvis together and have this thing made up." Said he, "I have nothing against Charley, but I am going to take it further." So I parted.

Previous to that time I had a conversation with Mr. McFarland, when we talked quite freely on this subject in the cars. We were on duty together and we were going home. I told him, "Sid., you are going to set up a provision store; why don't you put in for furnishing the hospital with certain goods?" Said he, "I don't know that they would give it to me out there now." Said I, "You have no business in this investigation; you do not know anything about it." Said he, "I don't know anything about it, only what I have heard." Said I, "Why do you not put in for it; if you can furnish as good material as others you will get it as well as others." I added, "This thing ought to be stopped anyhow; we are all friends; but Purvis and Wall are quarreling; I am really sorry." He said to me, "Now, there is a way to stop this investigation." I asked, "How?" He said, "You tell Purvis to go and see Wall and have a talk; I am not going to have anything to do with it; I am speaking with you; you are in it and Col. is in it." Col. is Mr. Crusor. Said he, "You tell Col. to go to his friend and tell him to go and see Wall and have a talk, and you will stop this investigation." Said I, "I don't know." "Well," said he, "I will tell him." I met Dr. Purvis after that, that same evening, I think, and said I, "Doctor, there is going to be an effort made to get you and Wall together, and I do not think I will have anything to do with it." Purvis said, "Charley, I am much obliged to you; I know there is going to be an effort, and I do not know anything about the investigation." I said that I heard the committee had reported, but I did not know anything about it. Said he, "No; the committee has not reported; but I would not meet Mr. Wall under any consideration unless he goes and withdraws every charge, and then states to the Secretary of the Interior that they were all false." Said I, "I am very glad colonel is going to ask you, no doubt, to make this thing up, and I know colonel will do it from pure motives." I told him then what Mr. McFarland had said, and added that he was going

to colonel. Sure enough he did go. He has a good heart toward them both, and sure enough he was inclined to bring them together and make this thing up. I thought it had gone too far. I thought, another thing, the doctor would compromise himself by making it up—they had gone so far and testified to so many things against him. I have lived here in Washington all my life, was born here, and have never been in positions where I could hear of anything wrong about the institution. I have never before heard anything against the institution, and I thought the charges were got up for a purpose, and I did not think the doctor would compromise himself, after going so far, in any way, shape, or form, or see Mr. Wall at all unless Mr. Wall did withdraw those charges, and I told him so. That is all I know about it.

JOHN H. COOK (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. A practicing lawyer here.

Q. Your office is in the Le Droit building, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you draw up some affidavits for witnesses in the case of the investigation of the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I did.

Q. Do you remember for what witnesses, or any of them? Did you draw one for Lucius Harcomb?—A. Yes; Lucius Harcomb, William Brown, and there were fifty or sixty of them altogether. I cannot call the names now; I would know them at once if I should see them.

Q. What was your method of drawing those affidavits?—A. With reference to the men you have named, some four or five came to the room of the surgeons, one at a time, sat down, and stated to me the facts contained in the affidavits, and I wrote down what they said, putting it in good English.

Q. You wrote it in their presence?—A. Yes, sir; they sat right by me. There may have been a surgeon present in one or two cases; Dr. Purvis may have been in the room, but in the majority of the instances the witness, or the person making the affidavit, and myself were alone in the room.

Q. Did you read the affidavits to them in every case?—A. I did; and you will find in the affidavits, I think, words interlined which they directed me to interline, showing what they intended to say. In every instance the affidavit was read over to them before they signed and swore to it.

Q. In the cases of those four or five persons who complained that they did not know the affidavits, you remember that that course was pursued?—A. I recollect distinctly that it was, and those men were very careful about what they said. They said they did not want to say anything to contradict the statements that they had made in their previous examination, or something to that effect, and therefore I said to them "You perhaps had better not make any affidavit at all." For reasons which I knew not, they were willing and anxious to make affidavits, and I took their statements.

Q. You did not change the ideas that they gave you in any degree, but endeavored to render their language into good English?—A. That was all. The affidavits will show that I interlined words to make them careful and strong in their favor, and at their suggestion.

Q. Lucius Harcomb, in an affidavit signed by his mark, made before O. S. B. Wall, justice of the peace, and a copy of which is sent to us from the Interior Department, says that he was not acquainted with

the contents of the affidavit, and it did not correctly represent his convictions?—A. I simply have to say to the committee, if you wish any remark from me on that subject, that that statement is simply untrue. Lucius Harcomb is a pretty sharp fellow. He came there to say some things and not others, and only what he said is contained in the affidavit that I drew up for him.

Q. William Brown says that you “proceeded to interrogate him and pretended to transcribe his answers. Having finished his questions, Cook directed him to sign a paper, which he did without reading, but he did not answer to it, as no oath was administered to him”?—A. I simply say to the committee that after putting down what William Brown said to me, and after reading it over to him, I then stood up and with his hand uplifted he made oath to every word contained in the affidavit. I read it to him again before he made oath, he standing and I standing.

Q. He quotes from that affidavit these words :

That complaints against the hospital did not begin until Mr. Felton came.

He says that he did not use such language. Do you remember that subject?—A. He certainly did. He said in substance, as far as I remember it now at this distance of time, that everything had passed along smoothly until Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson came there, and then complaints began.

Q. He further says that he never said or thought that the patients who testified before the investigating committee were continually talked to by Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson, and that they would not have testified as they did if they had not been urged to do so. Do you remember that subject?—A. Yes, sir. That was talked about also, and all of those men that testified said that the patients had been regularly talked to by Mr. Felton—the persons who testified before the investigating committee; and as I remember it now they also said that much of the testimony they gave was given because they were afraid that they would be turned out of the hospital if they did not so testify. In substance, that conversation occurred at the same time.

Q. Were these suggestions made by them, or were they drawn out by suggestions made by you?—A. I did not know anything about the matter at all. They were suggestions made by them. The witnesses appeared to have fallen out with Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson, and they were making their complaints to me, and in that way that subject came out. I knew nothing whatever of the fact that Felton had had any contact with them until it came out from them. Indeed, I was not prepared to say anything in their behalf. I simply went there to take down what they said, and I will say frankly with sympathy for them, for I did not want to be a party to foisting on the hospital or keeping on the hospital any gentlemen who were either incompetent or were treating them improperly. The sympathies I had were in the other direction.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You had no general knowledge of the hospital one way or the other?—A. No, sir; except that I have been here for ten years, and I have now and then passed in and out the hospital both during Dr. Reyburn's time and Dr. Palmer's time.

Q. You were in nobody's interest?—A. Nobody's interest at all. I want justice done there. If these gentlemen are not what they ought to be and are maltreating the patients, I am not in favor of them. I will say with reference to those affidavits that there never have been any made more fairly, giving the patients a fairer chance to state what

they felt in their souls than the affidavits that were sent to the Secretary of the Interior. I ought to add that all I knew about it was that I was representing Dr. Palmer as counsel in the absence of Mr. Riddle.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. How long was Mr. Riddle absent ?—A. Mr. Riddle, as I remember, did not get in town until the investigation had been under way for about a week. Mr. Miller was there a portion of the time, and I was there, and I think I was there also after Mr. Riddle came back, and he conducted the investigation. All I knew or saw was at that time.

Q. Are you a notary public ?—A. I am, and have been for the last six years.

Q. You were discharging your duty there as notary public ?—A. Simply that. At the suggestion of Dr. Palmer I went up to find out what these people had to say. The men came in and I went into the ward by myself to the women and took their statements, and they will be found in the affidavits presented to the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. In each instance you got the ideas of the patient and put those into the documents, and not your own ?—A. Exactly ; not my own at all ; and the ideas are not presented as strongly in favor of the hospital as the patients in some instances stated to me, because I could not sit down and make an affidavit for each patient. I simply took the substance of the leading facts on conference with the patients there. I think the committee will find that they are a good deal stronger than I put them in the affidavits.

JOHN T. RABBITT sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where is your place of business ?—Answer. In the Centre Market.

Q. What business are you in ?—A. Produce dealer.

Q. Do you furnish any articles to the Freedmen's Hospital ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ?—A. Chickens, eggs, butter, and cabbages when they are in season ; but cabbages not being in season, kail at this time of the year. In summer time I furnish vegetables, such as sweet-potatoes, tomatoes, &c.

Q. How long have you been furnishing eggs and chickens to the hospital ? A. About seven years ; between seven and eight years.

Q. You were furnishing them when Dr. Palmer went there ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And have continued since ?—A. Yes, sir ; I have continued since.

Q. Do you furnish about the same amount of eggs in the season that you formerly did ?—A. The same now as when I first went there ; 30 dozen is the usual order.

Q. Where do you deliver them ?—A. At the hospital. Sometimes the hospital wagon comes for them, and I put them in the wagon.

Q. Do you furnish good, fresh eggs ?—A. Yes, sir ; everything I send there is fresh. If it is not fresh they send it back again. They are very strict about the stuff out there.

Q. How do you deal with them as to prices compared with what you sell to other people ?—A. For a heap less money. They buy by the quantity, and we generally put things to them a cent or two cents less.

Q. What do you get for eggs ?—A. Thirteen cents a dozen this month.

Q. What is the average price this month to persons who do not take large quantities?—A. Fifteen cents retail.

Q. Do you pay anybody a percentage?—A. No, sir; I never had ten minutes' talk with any person out there. Dr. Palmer I never spoke to five minutes in my life; never saw him more than four or five times.

Q. You have no arrangement, and have not had any arrangement, by which anybody but the government is to profit by your trade?—A. That is all. Dr. Glennan sends the order.

Q. No understanding with Dr. Glennan that you are to deliver a less quantity than is charged to the government?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you deliver less than are charged?—A. No, sir; the order generally runs even, and when they send an order for fifty pounds, if the package is fifty-two or fifty-three I just send it, only charging according to the order.

Q. I understand that you deal fairly and honestly with the government?—A. Yes, sir; they get every pound. We weigh everything that goes out there.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. What do you charge the government for chickens now?—A. We charge them six. They get the very largest chickens we can get. They are grown fowls.

Q. Six what?—A. Six dollars a dozen. They must be large, grown fowls.

Q. A dollar a pair?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What would you charge me, for instance, if I marketed with you and wanted one pair?—A. A dollar or a dollar and a quarter. The size they get would bring a dollar and a quarter almost any time—a dollar at the cheapest time of the season.

Q. What is your mode of delivery of chickens; how often do you deliver?—A. When the oyster season is out, we generally deliver chickens three times a week; but this season of the year twice a week, on Tuesdays and Saturdays.

Q. Oftener at the other season?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When it is not the oyster season?—A. We deliver then three times a week.

Q. Therefore there would be more some weeks than others?—A. Just as the orders come we fill them. If orders come in blank form this way [exhibiting] we fill them just as they come:

[The order is as follows:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL,
Washington, March 2, 1878.

J. Rabbitt:

Twelve chickens.

P. GLENNAN,
Surgeon.]

They are very strict in quantity and quality of articles. We only send as they send orders.

SATURDAY, March 16, 1878.

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

Dr. DANIEL S. LAMB sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. A physician.

Q. Are you at present in the Government employ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?—A. At the Medical Museum.

Q. Have you ever visited the Freedmen's Hospital for any purpose?—A. Not in any way officially. I have been there as a casual visitor a few times.

Q. Have you had anything to do with *post mortem* examinations there?—A. I have made a number.

Q. How were those *post mortem* examinations made, with care and decency, or otherwise?—A. Always with care and decency.

Q. The same care and decency that are used in other cases of *post mortem* examinations?—A. The same.

Q. Something has been said about there being occasions of jocularity and indecency; is there any truth in that?—A. I never noticed any difference between *post mortems* there and *post mortems* elsewhere in private houses.

Q. Did you have occasion to go into the hospital itself while you were there?—A. Only casually—simply as matter of interest to myself—to look in once or twice.

Q. While there did you notice whether the hospital seemed to be as well conducted as institutions of that kind?—A. Quite as well as any I ever saw.

Q. When were you there?—A. I have been there once or twice this past winter.

Q. Before that time?—A. Probably the winter before last. I recollect being there a number of times.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Previous to this last winter?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Did you find the hospital on previous occasions the same as during the last winter or different, so far as cleanliness and appearance were concerned?—A. As far as I recollect I never saw any difference.

ADAM T. CAVIS sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. In what employment are you?—Answer. I am a printer at the Government Printing Office.

Q. A letter dated Washington, February 12, 1878, sent by you, has been handed to the committee. Is this your letter? [Handing to the witness the following letter:]

WASHINGTON, February 12, 1878.

Dr. G. S. PALMER:

SIR: Observing by the papers and the proceedings of Congress that your management of the Freedmen's Hospital is being investigated on charges and specifications of gross mismanagement financially and bad treatment of patients in every way, I have thought it due to fair-dealing to say that about two years ago a colored servant living with me developed such marked consumptive symptoms as compelled effort to get her in the Freedmen's Hospital, she having no relatives able to care for her.

Application was successful, and she remained there for a period of fifteen or more months, frequently visited by members of my family, and on one occasion by myself.

Her uniform statements to each and all of us were that she was well treated in every respect, lacking nothing in medicine, food, nourishments, and attendance. In fact, she expressed herself as being better cared for than she had ever been in her life.

I can bear testimony to the cleanliness of her ward, including her bedding, personal clothing, and all the surroundings of her room.

You, doctor, do not know me, nor I you, but I have thought the foregoing statement of Rhael Henderson due to the hospital management, whether beneficial to you or others.

Very respectfully,

A. T. CAVIS.

Place of business, proof-room, Government Printing Office; residence, 807 Eighth street N. E.

A. (Examining.) That is my letter.

Q. Are the statements contained in this letter correct?—A. They are as to matters of my own knowledge; and as to the rest, I believe them to be true.

Q. Just make a statement in reference to the matter.—A. Since sending the letter, I have refreshed my memory by letters written to my wife, in Baltimore; and in one of August 6th, I communicated information of a visit, which was on the day before I wrote that letter, therefore it must have been on the 5th of August, 1876. I had been trying for some time to see this colored girl; my wife had been importuning me to go and see her; and I went to the hospital. It was somewhat after the usual hour for visitors being allowed to enter, but under the circumstances, as my employment was very constant, so that I could not leave the office earlier, being very much occupied, I persuaded them, ultimately, to let me in. Ordinarily, without the consent of the physician in charge, they could not; but the chief nurse, as I suppose she might be called, who was in charge in the absence of the physician, took the responsibility of admitting me to see this girl. I found the ward in which she was, which was on the north side of the main building, close to the office, on the second floor. I found her there, near the east end. I talked with her for some time. I asked her how she was, how she was treated, and so on; and she answered me that she had everything she desired—she was carefully attended to. I observed that the bed-clothing was clean. All the appearances of her person indicated cleanliness. I glanced my eye around at the other beds, and I found that they were in a similar condition of cleanliness. She said she was treated well medically, and had no cause of complaint. I would mention that she had great prejudice in the first place about going to the hospital, and it was with the utmost effort that we succeeded in coaxing her to go, and therefore her gratification is more strongly in favor of her treatment.

Q. Did you visit the hospital more than once?—A. Only once.

Q. Did your wife visit the hospital?—A. My wife visited the hospital three times, and her testimony is coincident with mine.

Q. Your wife is not in the city, I believe, now?—A. She is here, but I would rather not have her summoned.

Q. The representations of the girl were the same to your wife as to yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your wife observed as you did?—A. Exactly the same. Her testimony would be much more strongly in favor of the proper management of the hospital, so far as that girl is concerned. Several of my children, females, were very much attached to this girl; they went to see her repeatedly, and carried her some little things from home. She said to them she had everything to eat there that she wished. My wife said that she found present on the table, by this girl, milk-punch. Her disease was pulmonary.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Is she living now ?—A. No; she is dead. She entered the hospital in January, 1876, and died in September following. She had a brother-in-law, who lived at the Freedman's building, named Benjamin West, and through his efforts she got in there, based on a letter I wrote.

Q. She was a servant of yours ?—A. Yes, sir. She was very much attached to our family, though not very long in our employ—upward of a year.

J. N. FIFIELD, sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your occupation ?—Answer. Policeman on the Metropolitan Police force.

Q. Have you visited the Freedman's Hospital officially ?—A. I have. I have been in that neighborhood, on that beat for the last seven years.

Q. What was the official occasion of your visiting there ?—A. I have been called on to take patients there and leave them there. They have always been very accommodating, and they take patients in there gratuitously.

Q. Have you visited there by day and by night ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your observation of the manner in which the hospital is conducted ?—A. As far as I know and as far as I have seen, it has been very well. I have seen them giving the patients chicken-soup and broth and the nourishment seemed to be very good.

Q. What has been your observation during the last three years, as to the cleanliness of the institution ?—A. Very good. I have been connected with other institutions of the kind myself before I went on the police force, and as far as I have seen, it was very cleanly.

Q. What seemed to be the treatment of the patients ?—A. Very good.

Q. Would you afterwards have occasion to see the persons you took there and talk to them ?—A. Yes, sir ; I used to have to call every day to see them. They were prisoners of mine at the time, who had been shot, for instance, and were very low. I have seen Dr. Purvis and Dr. Glennan attend to them daily, and they seemed to be very attentive to them.

Q. Would those persons make complaint to you of their treatment or food in any way ?—A. I have never heard any complaint. I did not know what I was summoned here for at all.

Q. You have not had complaints from these persons during these years ?—A. I have not. I have heard no complaints.

Q. Would they have opportunity to make complaint to you or be likely to make complaint to you if they were not well treated ?—A. They would. I have been on that beat and have been going around the hospital for seven years until the last two months, when I was transferred to a beat further out in the county. Up to that time for the last seven years it has been my duty to watch around that beat, and it is in a very bad neighborhood. There is near there a place called Cole's Row, full of very bad people ; and this hospital is right in that place. It is one of the worst places in the city of Washington, I suppose, for bad characters.

Q. You say you were removed from that beat about two months ago ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. During a month or two before you were removed were you in the hospital ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you notice any difference, any improvement from what it was before ?—A. I did not. I did not notice any change.

JAMES F. MCGRAW sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Metropolitan police officer.

Q. How long have you been connected with it?—A. Nearly five years; four years and six months.

Q. Have you had occasion as an officer to visit the Freedmen's Hospital during that time?—A. Yes, sir; frequently.

Q. What has called you there?—A. I have been there once or twice in cases of parties being shot; on another occasion in the case of a party who was knocked in the head with a brick, and in another case where a patient was very sick. I have had to summon parties there as witnesses, and to go over for the doctors, to bring them to the station and attend patients there once in a while.

Q. Would you be about in the hospital during those visits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was your observation of the conduct of the hospital?—A. It was always clean and respectable.

Q. Did you have conversation with any of the patients you took there as to their treatment?—A. Yes, sir. I used to go to see to them two or three times a week perhaps.

Q. What was their testimony in reference to the condition of the hospital?—A. I saw them always pretty well satisfied; always well treated.

Q. Have you seen any improvement in that respect during the last few months?—A. No, sir; it is just the same as it always was, to my knowledge and belief. I do not see a particle of change.

H. K. REDWAY sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Are you sergeant of the Metropolitan Police?—Answer. Yes, sir; one of the sergeants of the second precinct, where this hospital is located.

Q. How long have you been on the Metropolitan police?—A. Nearly ten years.

Q. Have you had occasion, officially, to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I have.

Q. How often do you think you have been there?—A. I have been there, perhaps, twice a week, then once a month, then once in two months, and so along for the last seven years. I have been in that precinct over seven years.

Q. What has been the occasion of your going there?—A. Generally to look after parties who had been injured and taken there for treatment.

Q. What was your observation of the manner in which the hospital has been conducted?—A. As far as I have been able to judge, it seemed to be well conducted; the patients seemed to be well cared for, and looked clean, and they were kept as cleanly as possible, as I should think patients could be, in the condition some of them were. I will state that I am particularly acquainted with Dr. Glennan, and was acquainted with him during the war. He was surgeon at the Stone Hospital, the Eye and Ear Infirmary, on Meridian Hill. I was very sick at Mount Pleasant Hospital. He used to come in to see me, and, being acquainted with him, I used to go over there, sometimes, to see him, as well as to look after parties taken there.

Q. Those visits, official and friendly, to Dr. Glennan, gave you an opportunity to see the manner in which the hospital was conducted?—A. Yes, sir; and being unfortunate enough to be in hospital once myself for awhile, I knew something of his treatment.

Q. Your knowledge of the matter, then, is that the Freedmen's Hospital was cleanly, and patients seemed to be contented and well taken care of?—A. So far as I could judge.

Q. Did you ever have any complaint from those you took there?—A. Never. We had men that were taken there, shot about the head and other places. I never heard any complaint. Their wounds seemed to be dressed, and well cared for generally.

Q. Were the men you took there all put in Dr. Glennan's ward, or in some of the other wards sometimes?—A. I have had occasion to go but very few times into Dr. Purvis's room, perhaps two or three times; generally into Dr. Glennan's.

Q. What was the condition of Dr. Purvis's ward?—A. It seemed to be clean and in good condition.

Q. Have you noticed any improvement in the hospital of late in that particular?—A. I do not know that I have. The doctors have been uniformly kind there. Whenever we have had occasion to send for one they have come at all times, night and day, whenever it was so that they could. They have always been ready to receive patients without any formality for the time being. It has been a great relief to us to be able to have some place to take parties who were badly injured and sick.

Q. Patients are received temporarily, you say. Do you apply after that to the Secretary of the Interior?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that, for them to remain there, except temporarily, you would get permission from the Secretary of the Interior?—A. They would remain there until they recovered, or recovered sufficiently to be sent away.

WILLIAM H. WEST (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Are you connected with the Metropolitan police?—Answer. I am.

Q. How long have you been?—A. In the neighborhood of eight years.

Q. Have you had occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital officially?—

A. Yes, sir; on several different occasions I have had to visit it.

Q. What business took you there?—A. I have had to go there to take patients there who were injured. In one instance I remember that a man was run over in the street—a very old man by the name of Travis Taylor, about seventy-odd years old. He was run over in the street, and I arrested the party that drove over him, took him to the police court, and took this old gentleman to the hospital and put him in the care of Dr. Purvis.

Q. Did Dr. Purvis receive him and take care of him?—A. He did, in the most kindly manner; so much so that the old gentleman, after his recovery, spoke in great credit to Dr. Purvis for the kind manner in which he was treated.

Q. What was your observation during your visits there as to the condition of the hospital?—A. I never found it in any other way than the most cleanly manner in each ward I visited. I visited several. I visited Dr. Glennan's and Dr. Purvis's wards—Dr. Purvis's more frequently than any other—and I have always found that in the most cleanly condition.

Q. Did you talk with these patients that you took there, and did they ever complain of their treatment?—A. No, sir. I have talked with five

or six, and with some whom I did not take there. In one instance, Officer McGraw took a boy there who was hit in the head with a stone, and others who were shot, and they always spoke in the highest terms of the manner in which they were treated. I never heard a complaint from one before this complaint. Robert Johnson was the first man I ever heard say anything against the hospital.

Q. Are the policemen generally of the opinion in regard to this hospital of you four gentlemen who have been examined here, as far as you know?—A. Yes, sir. I have never heard any express themselves only in the same manner and with the greatest regard as to Dr. Purvis; and, in fact, all the doctors.

Q. You have heard them talk among themselves in that way?—A. Yes, sir.

Dr. THOMAS B. HOOD sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. Physician.

Q. What is your present employment?—A. I am the medical referee of the Pension Office.

Q. How long have you been in the Pension Office?—A. I believe six years.

Q. Were you appointed on a board of investigation by the Secretary of the Interior on the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I was.

Q. When were you appointed?—A. September 24th is the date of the order detailing me to the board.

Q. Who were your associates?—A. Dr. George Ewing and J. K. Walsh.

Q. Is Walsh a physician?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you a copy of the instructions given you at that time?—A. I have the original, not a copy.

Q. Please hand it to the committee.—A. I will. It is :

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1877.

A board to consist of Dr. T. B. Hood of the Pension Office, Dr. George C. Ewing, of the Secretary's Office, and Dr. J. K. Walsh, of the General Land Office, is hereby constituted to examine into the condition and conduct of the Freedmen's Hospital, especially as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in the charges and specifications, under date of August 25, 1877, and signed by Robert T. Johnson.

The board will proceed with the examination as soon as practicable, and will be allowed free access to any and all such books, papers, records, and rooms of the hospital as may be necessary to the purposes of the examination, and will also be allowed to take the evidence of officials, employes, or inmates of the hospital under oath, as prescribed by section 183 of the Revised Statutes.

Upon completion of their examination the board will make report in writing to the Secretary of the Interior, together with such suggestions or recommendations as may be deemed advisable.

The proceedings of the board will be conducted in secret sessions.

C. SCHURZ,
Secretary.

Q. Did you proceed to make such investigation?—A. Yes, sir; within a few days after that date—probably, within a week.

Q. Did you take the evidence by short-hand?—A. A part of it.

Q. And a part of it not?—A. A part of it not.

Q. I see by the instructions you are thus directed: "Upon completion of their examination, the board will make report in writing to the Secretary of the Interior, together with such suggestions or recommendations as may be deemed advisable." Did you understand that to

refer to the report of your conclusions, or the report of all testimony you should take?—A. The report of conclusions.

Q. Did you make that report?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. (Exhibiting a document.) Is this the report you made?—A. (Examining.) I believe it is.

The document is as follows :

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
November 13, 1877.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF INVESTIGATION FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL.

Members of Board.—T. B. Hood, George Ewing, Jno. K. Walsh.

59 inclosures.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1877.

SIR: The board constituted by your order of 24th September last "to examine into the condition and conduct of the Freedmen's Hospital, especially as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in the charges and specifications under date of August 25, 1877, and signed by Robert T. Johnson," has the honor to submit the following report upon the charges and specifications signed by Robert T. Johnson, dated August 25, 1877:

SPECIFICATION FIRST.—"In that said Palmer provides the patients in said hospital revolting food measured out to each in quantity insufficient to satisfy hunger; the provender is execrably cooked and especially unfit for invalids, whose condition requires good, palatable, and nutritious food. Beeves' heads and legs, oftentimes putrid, chopped up and concocted into odious messes; pickled pork and beef, saturated in brine from time immemorial till it becomes semi-petrified and rusty; ancient mackerel, corroded with salt and nauseating in smell; sour bread and musty hominy; a solitary potato in its jacket, about the size of a hen's egg, allotted each patient at dinner, and insipid slops nominated coffee and tea, constitute, in substance, the regular diet of the institution, and the meals served in the mess-room do not actually cost more than seven cents per day for each patient.

Superannuated, slovenly, and unskillful persons are employed as cooks at four dollars per month for the services of each, and such culinary botches could not fail to spoil the best of viands if intrusted to them to prepare for the table; but with inferior provisions such as said Palmer supplies, they produce detestable messes that are not fit for any human being to eat."

The statements contained in this specification are not sustained by the facts; the quantity of food furnished has been amply sufficient, its quality good, and the cooking found to compare favorably with the average of hospitals.

Accompanying marked "6" is the "full diet" table of Seminary Hospital, Georgetown, D. C., given as a standard in the Hospital Steward's Manual, page 194, and marked "7" the "full diet" table of Freedmen's Hospital.

From January 1st to October 31st, 1877, the average quantity of bread furnished each inmate has been one pound per day, of meat $21\frac{3}{4}$ pounds per month, of milk $1\frac{1}{2}$ gallons per month, together with a sufficient quantity of sugar, coffee, rice, hominy, butter, eggs, &c. The tables marked 8, 9, 10, and 11, give an idea of the quantity and variety of food furnished this hospital from July, 1874, to October 31, 1877.

In addition an "extra diet" is supplied, and consists of such lighter articles of food and delicacies as may be directed by the attending physicians; this was found of considerable variety, well adapted to the needs and cravings of sick people, and furnished to a very large proportion of the inmates.

The appropriation for subsistence for fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, is \$18,000; which gives an average of about 20 cents per day for each inmate.

SPECIFICATION SECOND.—"In that, under said Palmer's management, the bath-room and water-closets attached to the male wards of said hospital are kept in an offensive condition; slops are emptied therein, and filthy utensils, used by the sick, are washed in the bath-tub in which the patients of the respective wards bathe, whereby they are exposed to imminent danger of contracting terrible diseases, and malaria is liable to be generated by the foul odors and decomposing matter therein that poison the atmosphere."

It was found by personal inspection that the bath-rooms, water-closets, &c., were in as good condition as could be expected, especially when the plan of the hospital buildings and character of the inmates are taken into consideration.

SPECIFICATION THIRD.—"In that, under said Palmer's management, the furniture, fixtures, and utensils in the wards are dilapidated, uncomfortable, mean, and unsuited for service; that the bedsteads, beds, pillows, sheets, blankets, spreads, chairs, tables,

and other articles were transferred to said hospital by the government or sanitary commission when the Army hospitals were abandoned at the close of the late war, and have been in constant service and received severe usage for more than ten years; that the beds, bedding, and wainscots of the walls are infested with multitudinous and repulsive vermin of various kinds, and no proper effort is made to destroy them, and that the entire furniture and equipments of any one ward would not sell for the sum of one hundred dollars."

The board find that the bedsteads are of the style and character employed in Army hospitals, and have probably been in use for many years, but are still serviceable; that the beds and bedding have been changed from time to time as necessity has required; in that worn-out mattresses have been replaced by new ones manufactured in the hospital, and blankets purchased in such quantities from year to year to replace old ones as the appropriations would allow.

It was found upon inspection that a portion of the beds and bedding were old and worn, but it is believed that they are as good as the appropriation will allow, and such as would ordinarily be found in hospitals.

It is undoubtedly true that vermin of a certain class do exist in the beds and wainscoting of the walls, but it was not found that they existed in excessive numbers when the character of the inmates and their associations are considered. Proper measures we believe have been taken, under the instructions of the surgeons of the wards, to abate this nuisance as far as practicable, but it must be taken into consideration that the buildings are of such construction as to afford lodgment to certain classes of vermin, such as bed-bugs and water-bugs, which could be destroyed wholly and successfully only by the destruction of the buildings themselves.

SPECIFICATION FOURTH.—"In that, under said Palmer's management, patients afflicted with contagious, infectious, and loathsome disorders are commingled promiscuously in the wards with the other patients, who are thus exposed to the dangers of contracting terrible maladies, whereas the patients so afflicted should be classified and congregated in private rooms, of which there is an abundance in said hospital, and thus be isolated from the other patients, who would be secured immunity from harm from that source."

Patients suffering with the ordinarily so-called "contagious" diseases are not admitted to this hospital. The inmates may be divided into two classes—one comprising those not properly inmates of a hospital, but of an asylum, consisting of the old, decrepit, infirm, insane, idiotic, &c., and this class, it is understood, constitute a kind of legacy from the old Freedmen's Bureau, and have been maintained in the hospital from its inception. The remaining class represent most of the non-contagious maladies, and, since they are necessarily commingled in the wards, it cannot be otherwise than that they subject each other to annoyance and inconvenience. We were not able to find an abundance of private rooms, nor indeed any which could properly be assigned to private patients; such rooms in connection with each ward being intended for and used by attendants, and for the isolation of an occasional patient suffering with what is properly a loathsome disease; in short, the hospital is not constructed with any reference to the isolation of inmates.

We have failed to learn of any instance wherein one inmate has communicated disease to another by reason of contiguity, and do not consider it probable that such should happen.

SPECIFICATION FIFTH.—"In that, through said Palmer's remissness, consumptive and asthmatic patients are quartered in the wards among the other patients, who are thus compelled to breathe an atmosphere contaminated with the exhalations from diseased lungs, and are deprived of their sleep and disturbed in their rest at night by incessant and painful coughing, hawking, and expectorating, which in pulmonary complaints are infinitely worse in the night-time than during the day; whereas such obnoxious patients could readily be isolated from the others by assigning them to private rooms, which, with a reckless disregard for the health and comfort of the patients, are permitted to be occupied by employes of the institution, or by persons that are comparatively well."

Consumptive and asthmatic patients were found commingled in the wards with other patients, but we do not believe that they could be assigned to private rooms or in any way segregated. The annoyances complained of have always been recognized as of the counterbalancing evils and inseparable from hospital life.

SPECIFICATION SIXTH.—"In that said Palmer has allowed private persons to keep three cows on the hospital premises at the government expense while he purchased from outside parties all the milk required for the use of the institution, yet the same number of cows belonging to the hospital could have been kept at the same cost and supplied the hospital with pure milk, whereby the government would have saved the large milk-bills that have been paid for that institution needlessly."

The evidence shows that the cows mentioned were not fed at government expense, and we do not think it would be practicable to keep a sufficient number of cows to supply the institution with milk. The pasturage on the limited hospital grounds would not be sufficient for one cow.

SPECIFICATION SEVENTH.—"Said Palmer permits the Howard University and the Howard mansion to be constantly supplied with water at the government expense; the tank on each of these buildings is daily filled with water pumped by the government engineer at said hospital, who runs the government engine for that purpose with government fuel, at an estimated cost of five dollars per day, and the sum of eighteen hundred dollars of public money is thus misused annually, to which extent the appropriation to said hospital is diminished. Such conversion of public property to private use is a grave offense that demands punishment of the offender and restitution to the government."

We find that at the time Dr. Palmer assumed charge of the Freedmen's Hospital a lease existed between the former surgeon-in-chief (Dr. R. Reyburn) and Howard University, in which, among other rights reserved to the said university, it was agreed that the engine located on the Freedmen's Hospital grounds, but belonging to the university, should be used "to pump water to the main buildings of Howard University one hour per day (Sundays excepted)." Copy of lease herewith, marked "13." In making a new lease, July 19, 1875 (copy herewith, marked "14"), which was approved by the honorable Secretary of the Interior in communication to Dr. Palmer, under date of July 22, 1875, the same agreement was made as to the use of the engine to pump water to the main buildings of Howard University.

The expense incurred by compliance with this provision of the lease does not exceed eighty (\$80) dollars per annum.

SPECIFICATION EIGHTH.—"Said Palmer has done grievous harm to the inmates of said hospital by abrogating the custom of employing a night-nurse for each ward, but compelling one man during the night to take charge of two wards containing at least sixty patients, and also attend to four fires in cold weather, which onerous duties cannot be properly discharged by a single individual. Hence patients, in severe cases, suffer intensely from neglect, and disturb the other patients by their cries for succor and relief, while the dying are abandoned to their fate, and suffered to expire in darkness and gloom, without care, solace, or sympathy, and are hustled out of the ward to the dead-house as soon as the vital spark is extinguished."

The testimony fails to show that Dr. Palmer has abrogated any custom heretofore existing in the employment of night-nurses. The same number and the same individuals, with one or two exceptions, are employed now as under former administrations of the hospital. It is true that comparatively a small number of night-nurses are regularly employed, but it is expected, and properly so, that convalescents and others should, in emergency, furnish the extra help needed. In the wards which are occupied by the old and infirm only, no necessity exists for the employment of permanent night-nurses, and in the wards where needed a sufficient number of such nurses are, in our opinion, employed, and we failed to discover any instance of neglect of the dying by reason of insufficiency of such help.

SPECIFICATION NINTH.—"In that, under said Palmer's management, goods, wares, and merchandise required for said hospital have not been purchased as far as practicable on contracts awarded to lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement, as is the custom with the War and Navy Departments, and in every well-regulated government institution, but have, to a great extent, been procured from retail dealers in small quantities from time to time as the immediate exigency demanded, whereby articles of inferior quality were obtained at high prices, the public money was squandered, and the hospital failed to receive the full benefit of the appropriation granted it by Congress."

It is found, from examination of the bills for supplies, that the prices paid were generally fair and reasonable; for some few articles probably higher prices have been paid than the lowest wholesale market prices; these articles were few in number, and taking the purchases altogether it is doubtful if the supplies could have been obtained more advantageously to the hospital.

The principal exception to this statement is found in the bills of Charles Fink & Co., in which the prices are somewhat higher than the prevailing rates. The attention of Mr. O. S. B. Wall (the principal member of the firm) was called to this by letter from Dr. Palmer dated October 7, 1876 (copy herewith, marked 49).

The price paid for milk was the subject of consideration, and it was explained on the ground of the high standard of excellence, and moreover that the price had been reduced until it was now very considerably lower than under former administrations.

SPECIFICATION TENTH.—"The legitimate expenses of said hospital, as conducted under its present management, do not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars per annum, and all money beyond that sum drawn out of the Treasury has been misused, squandered, embezzled, or purloined. Through such perversion or abstraction of appropriated funds the government is alleged to have been plundered and the hospital defrauded to the amount of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars during the past five years, while the members of the medical staff, managers of the institution, have been raised from limited means to affluence, become the owners of valuable real estate, and fare sumptuously every day at the expense of the poor and the sick, the maimed and the dying, for whom

Congress made liberal provision, if the public bounty had been honestly and judiciously administered for the sole benefit and behoof of the beneficiaries, and not for the individual profit and aggrandizement of the functionaries, to whom the execution of the trust was confided."

The vouchers on file at the Interior Department and the evidence adduced furnish sufficient proof that the full amount appropriated for this hospital has been expended for the purposes for which it was intended, and none other; and not a particle of evidence has been presented to show that any portion of the several amounts annually appropriated has been "misused, squandered, embezzled, or purloined." Nor has the board been able to procure any evidence that the "medical staff, managers of the institution," have in any way benefited from their connection therewith except in the legitimate manner provided by law.

SPECIFICATION ELEVENTH.—"Under said Palmer's management, lunatics, idiots, blind persons and able-bodied paupers are permanent inmates of said hospital, instead of being consigned to the institutions specially established for the reception of such unfortunates. Said hospital is a sanitary institution, created solely for the accommodation, care and treatment of invalids, and the presence of these intruders among the patients is detrimental, repugnant, and dangerous to them. These individuals, moreover, occupy much room in the wards, which ought to be appropriated to such persons as require medical and surgical treatment, many of whom are crowded out of said hospital by these objectionable inmates; the expense of supporting these creatures is a misuse of the money appropriated for the maintenance of said hospital, and the patients, to that extent, are deprived of their rights and property. The lunatics and idiots are not treated as patients in charge of nurses, but are consigned to the custody of keepers, who frequently beat them and reduce them to subjection by fear and violence. They are clothed in rags, are filthy in their habits, and subsist on refuse and slops. These obnoxious persons are alleged to be domiciled in said hospital for the purpose of augmenting the total number of inmates, in order that the maintenance of said hospital may plausibly be represented as costing more than is actually expended for its support."

This specification is based on a total misapprehension as to the spirit of this institution as well as of the facts; from the outset the blind, decrepit, old, idiotic, and insane indigent have been admitted to its privileges as well as those needing medical and surgical treatment; and although few of the former class have been admitted in latter years, yet the board do not find any provision of law excluding them. It is to the class of permanent inmates that clothing is issued regularly, and it has not been found that any of them have suffered from lack of proper supply; to the transient patients it is issued only where essentially necessary, but in no case have we found it withheld from them except for good and sufficient reasons.

It is very difficult, by reason of the mental condition of some of these inmates, to keep them properly clad, but, from a personal inspection and the evidence adduced, we are satisfied that in every respect they are as well cared for as possible under the circumstances; and as to being subjected to personal violence and abuse, it was found that but in few instances has force been used in correcting them, and the circumstances appear to have justified the course pursued.

SPECIFICATION TWELFTH.—"Since the commencement of the fiscal year, on the 1st day of July, 1877, three surgeons have been officially connected with said hospital, notwithstanding the appropriation act makes provision for the employment of two surgeons only for the current year. If these three surgeons have received compensation for their services at said hospital since July 1, 1877, the payment to one of them was unauthorized and illegal, the public money to that extent was misused for that purpose, and the money appropriated to said hospital was squandered to the amount of such disbursement. If, however, one of said surgeons continued his professional connection with said hospital and treated its patients without receiving any salary or compensation from the appropriation, it is palpable that he derives a profit out of the institution equivalent in value to his services, inasmuch as these surgeons are not so disinterested and philanthropic as to professionally treat poor, friendless, uninfluential invalids without pecuniary reward. Either circumstance evinces official malfeasance, unscrupulous greed, and flagrant betrayal of a sacred trust in the management of said hospital and its executive officers."

It was found that prior to June 30, 1877, there were employed in this hospital five medical officers, to wit:

Dr. G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief, salary \$2,400 per annum.

P. Glennan, executive officer, salary \$2,100 per annum.

C. B. Purvis, house physician, salary \$2,100 per annum.

A. T. Augusta, ward physician, salary \$1,200 per annum.

C. Goerner, dispensary clerk, salary \$1,080 per annum.

Since that period, with the exception of the month of July, when Dr. Goerner was still borne upon the rolls, there have been employed three medical officers, viz:

Dr. G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief, salary \$1,400 per annum.

Dr. P. Glennan, assistant surgeon and dispensary clerk, salary \$1,200 per annum.

Dr. C. B. Purvis, house physician, paid \$150 for July; and since, at the rate of \$1,400 per annum.

The salaries of Drs. Palmer and Glennan are fixed and provided for in the act making appropriation for the hospital for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878.

The manner of paying Dr. Purvis is explained in Dr. Palmer's written testimony (marked 5), by drawing upon a fund which has accumulated to the credit of the hospital in the shape of a hospital or surplus fund. This fund is in the hands of the disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and is drawn upon in the same manner as appropriated funds, and has always been held as a reserve fund to draw upon in emergencies, which is the case in the opinion of the surgeon-in-chief in this matter, he considering the services of three medical officers essential to the proper management of the institution; in which opinion we concur.

Upon the supplementary specifications signed by Robert T. Johnson, dated October 18, 1877.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION FIRST.—"Halls, lecture-rooms, dissecting-rooms, and private apartments, used or occupied exclusively by the Howard University Medical College, have been lighted and heated at the government expense out of the appropriation to Freedmen's Hospital, in contravention of law, since the first day of July, 1876, to the present time, through the procurement or with the knowledge of said Palmer."

The facts are that some months after Dr. Palmer assumed control of the hospital, to wit, July 19, 1875, he executed the lease heretofore referred to (marked 14), which was approved by the honorable Secretary of the Interior, July 22, 1875; under the terms of which certain rooms, &c., which had been in the occupancy of the medical department of Howard University were reserved to its use; and it was also agreed that these rooms, &c., should be heated and lighted at the expense of the government.

This lease expired June 30, 1876, and was not renewed nor, so far as we can ascertain or believe, were any of its provisions canceled. Dr. Palmer has continued to light and heat the said rooms in accordance with the terms of this expired lease, which, under the circumstances, it was his duty to do.

It might be explained that the lease referred to was simply in continuance of one which Dr. Palmer found in existence upon entering on the duties of surgeon-in-charge, and that he agreed to perform nothing new.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION SECOND.—"Furniture, fixtures, goods, and chattels, belonging to the government or purchased by it out of the appropriation to said hospital, have been placed in the halls, rooms, or apartments occupied by said medical college or the students thereof, or been used exclusively for the exercises, functions, benefit, or advantage of said college, in contravention of law through the procurement or with the knowledge or sanction of said Palmer."

It is not found that any "furniture, fixtures, goods, and chattels belonging to the government or purchased by it, &c., are being used by the medical department of Howard University, with the exception of four stoves used in lieu of steam on the score of economy to carry out the agreement in lease as to heating these premises. (See Dr. Palmer's statement, marked 52.)"

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION THIRD.—"Students of the Howard University Medical College have been furnished with meals or board at the government expense, defrayed by money diverted from the annual appropriations to the Freedmen's Hospital. An exclusive table, denominated the 'students' table,' was regularly set in an apartment of said hospital, and was furnished and equipped in a proper and attractive manner, in marked contrast to the rude style and repulsive appearance of the patients' and nurses' tables. Choice meats, fish, vegetables, puddings, pies, fruits, and other delicacies were profusely supplied to the favored students, who were intruders at the hospital, and in nowise proper recipients of the government bounty. Students' meals were prepared especially for them by the best cook employed at the hospital, and served at fashionable hours, while the patients and hospital employes, on the contrary, were restricted to scanty and unsuitable food, odiously cooked and served, consisting, to a large extent, of bad provisions, offal, and tainted, putrid, and spoiled provisions, wholly unmerchandise, and the refuse or *débris* of the market. If said medical students paid for the meals or board which were provided for them at the government expense out of the hospital appropriations, it was incumbent on said Palmer to account for and dispose of the receipts in the manner provided by law, which this complainant is informed and believes was not done. If, on the other hand, said students were gratuitously furnished with such meals or board, then said Palmer has wasted, perverted, or misappropriated public property for private use, without compensation, in contravention of law, whereby the government was defrauded, the hospital injured, and the patients deprived of their rights, plundered of their money, and subjected to scanty or unfit sustenance, and the comfort and conveniences which invalids require."

It was found that it had been the custom of this hospital, since its organization, to employ medical students of Howard University as resident students, they performing services as assistants in dispensary, writers of clinics, and various other duties in return for their board. This custom has been continued by Dr. Palmer, who, in common with his predecessor, as well as the other medical officers of the hospital, believed that services fully equivalent in value to the expense incurred were rendered by these students, without whose employment considerable amounts would have been compelled to be expended in the way of salaries.

We do not believe, from the testimony, that any discrimination was made in their favor as to the quality of food, &c., and we are of the opinion, from the testimony of the medical officers, who are the only persons capable of judging, that the services rendered fully compensated for any additional expense incurred for their board.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION FOURTH.—“Under the management of said Palmer, human remains, offal, and *débris* from the dissecting-rooms of said college have been stealthily removed, at night from the college building, and inhumed on the premises of said hospital, in dangerous proximity to the wards, water-pipes, or cistern that furnish the water supply of said hospital; and, furthermore, deceased patients have been surreptitiously transported from the hospital-wards or dead-house to said dissecting-rooms to be operated on, of which corpses some were returned at night to the dead-house in a cut or mangled condition, and the rest, after dissection, were preserved, in part, for skeletons or specimens, and the remains, offal, and *débris* were hidden in hospital grounds or some other place unfit for sepulture.”

We find, from the evidence, that in but one instance was material from the dissecting-room buried on the hospital premises, and that this was done without the knowledge of the surgeon-in-charge; and it does not appear that any deleterious effect was produced on the inmates or any danger incurred of contaminating the water-supply.

No evidence has been submitted showing that dead bodies have been removed from the dead-house of the hospital to the dissecting-rooms of the medical college.

SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATION FIFTH.—“Government property, appropriated to the use of the Freedmen's Hospital and committed to the official custody of said Palmer, has been disposed of, to a large amount, at public or private sale, and the proceeds thereof have not been accounted for or paid over to the government by said Palmer in the manner prescribed by law.”

The amount of government property disposed of by Dr. Palmer has been small, so far as can be ascertained; and we believe that the proceeds of such sales have been properly accounted for, as evidenced by statements herewith, marked 34 and 35.

The specifications having been treated in detail, the charge based thereon may now be considered:

CHARGE.—“I hereby charge Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, in the city of Washington, with dereliction of duty and official malfeasance; with culpable disregard for the safety, comfort, and welfare of the patients in that institution; with maladministration of its pecuniary affairs, whereby the public money appropriated for the maintenance and support of said hospital has been to a large extent perverted, embezzled, or abstracted; with wrongfully using or permitting others to use public property in his official custody for the benefit of private parties, and with being disqualified to hold the position and exercise the functions of surgeon-in-chief of said Freedmen's Hospital.”

FINDING.—From a careful and conscientious consideration of the testimony, the board does not find any of the above charges against Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, sustained.

CHARGES OF J. R. FRANCIS.

As to the subject-matter embraced in the communication of J. R. Francis, dated January 7, 1877, and August 26, 1877, addressed to Hon. J. M. Langston, and referred by him to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, it may be divided into two separate and distinct classes.

The one relating to Dr. Palmer's conduct as dean of the medical department of Howard University, and with which, therefore, this board cannot deal.

The other class, relating chiefly to Dr. Palmer's conduct as surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, and charging distinctly that he discriminates in favor of white applicants for admission to the hospital, has been carefully considered, and touching it we have to state that all the inquiries, as well as the reports of admissions, go to show that no such discrimination has been exercised. It is believed that applicants of all classes have been admitted without any question of color, the only requirement being that the applicant should be a proper subject for medical or surgical treatment at the expense of the government.

Mr. Francis being absent from the city, a communication was addressed him October 19, 1877 (copy herewith, marked 38), to which no reply has been received.

The names of the following parties were handed to the board as being willing to

testify, to wit: Mr. O. S. B. Wall, Mr. Sidney McFarlaud, Mr. Neely, clerk Treasury Department.

Mr. Wall, on being notified, declined to appear, on the ground that he knew nothing of his own knowledge in regard to abuses.

Mr. Sidney McFarland declined on very much the same ground (letter herewith marked 44).

Mr. Neely, to whom was sent an invitation to testify, (copy marked 40), stated to the messenger that he would answer in writing, which he has not done.

SUMMARY.

The board, giving due weight and consideration to everything that has been adduced bearing on the management of the Freedmen's Hospital while under the charge of Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, believes:

That no foundation has existed or does now exist for the charge of maladministration in any respect.

That errors of judgment have been committed there is no doubt, but it is the opinion of the board that Dr. Palmer has conducted the affairs in an honest, conscientious, and efficient manner, with the same care for government property and funds as would be evinced by a thoroughly capable man in the case of his own private property.

In the absence of any definite law or instructions to guide him, he has safely adhered in a great degree to the traditions and precedents of the institution. Where he believed abuses existed, he corrected them, as instanced in the discharge of a chaplain at \$100 per month, and the cutting off of rations to the employes, a most expensive custom to the government, which had been handed down from the time of the quasi connection of the hospital with the Army.

It is a notable fact that, with no important exceptions (in point of fact only one or two nurses), the employes have all been connected with the hospital for many years.

No evidence worthy of consideration was adduced reflecting upon the subordinate medical officers, Drs. Glenuan and Purvis, and the fact of their connection with the institution through all its changes for the past twelve or thirteen years is conclusive as to their efficiency and professional fitness for their positions.

The evidence signally fails in proving any misappropriation of public property, the few instances cited in the testimony being satisfactorily shown to have no foundation; the trivial articles mentioned belonging either to private individuals or Howard University.

The custom of the surgeon-in-charge of giving his horse one feed per day is explained by him as due to the large amount of work necessarily performed in the purchases and other matters connected with the outside duties of the institution.

In regard to the experiments on the palmetto leaves, the board, after mature consideration of all the testimony, believes the expense, if any, incurred thereby to have been too trivial for mention; and that if any had been incurred, the responsibility therefor would not rest with Dr. Palmer, who was careful to order that none should be.

The board has conscientiously endeavored to obtain every iota of evidence that could enlighten its members in this investigation, and in submitting the testimony have to explain its voluminous character by this fact. That much of it is irrelevant we are well aware, but from the ignorance and evident bias of many of the witnesses, it was deemed expedient, in view of probable review without the important aid of the presence of the witnesses, that it should be as explicit as the scope of this investigation would permit.

The board, composed as it is of members of the medical profession, has to express the opinion that the Freedmen's Hospital is not a first-class institution. In the first instance, the location and manner of construction of the buildings are bad; they have been in occupancy for something like eight years, and being frame, are liable to absorb and retain noxious germs that experience teaches us may only be dormant for lack of the exciting causes to the development of malignant disease.

Again, the appropriations are not now nor have they been of late years sufficiently large to enable the officers in charge to conduct a model hospital.

From the fact that the inmates as a body are from the lowest and most destitute of all our indigents, and their demands so importunate and numerous, it has begot and fixed the idea that the wards of this institution should be occupied by the very largest number compatible with comfort. This is a laudable feeling, and to the charitable, not biased by the demands of the present advanced state of the medical art, it would seem not to admit of question that the greater the number cared for in the present unquestionably comfortable hospital the greater the good done.

The board does not doubt but that one-half of the present number of inmates might be cared for in accordance with the highest standard of hospital excellence, but it would not nor could it, viewing all the peculiar surroundings, coolly recommend the deprivation to so many of the immense relief now afforded them.

To relieve the surgeon-in-chief of a portion of the great responsibility of managing

an institution where the limits of his powers are so loosely defined, as well as to preclude the possibility of such grave charges being repeated with so little to sustain them, we would recommend the appointment by the honorable Secretary of the Interior of a board of visitors to the Freedmen's Hospital, with the usual powers of such bodies. The board can recommend no great expenditures upon a property not owned by the government, but would suggest the following improvements:

1st. The construction of covered ways from the wards to the dining-room, as also to the water-closets situated outside the wards.

2d. The addition to the furniture in the wards of small tables between the beds, as was the custom in army hospitals.

3d. That when the weather shall permit, the interiors of the wards be renovated by an additional hard coating to the walls, and painting of wainscots, &c.

These improvements may be made at comparatively slight cost, and are proper objects for expenditure from the "hospital" or "surplus" fund of the institution, and, therefore, would necessitate no appropriation of public funds.

The following papers are submitted:

1. Charge and specifications by Robert T. Johnson, dated August 25, 1877.
2. Letter of Hon. J. M. Langston, dated September 17, 1877, inclosing two letters from J. R. Francis.
3. Supplementary specifications by Robert T. Johnson, dated October 18, 1877.
4. Letter of F. E. Felton, dated October 24, 1877, assuming responsibility for charges, &c.
5. Reply of Dr. G. S. Palmer to the charges.
6. Full diet table of Seminary hospital.
7. Full diet table of Freedmen's Hospital.
8. Statement of meats furnished Freedmen's Hospital.
9. Statement of flour furnished Freedmen's Hospital.
10. Statement of sugar, &c., furnished Freedmen's Hospital.
11. Statement of butter, &c., furnished Freedmen's Hospital.
12. Statement of number of patients, Freedmen's Hospital.
13. Copy of lease for fiscal year ending June 30, 1875.
14. Copy of lease for fiscal year ending June 30, 1876.
15. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated August 25, 1877.
16. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated September 23, 1877.
17. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated September 23, 1877.
18. Letter of F. E. Felton, dated September 27, 1877.
19. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated October 1, 1877.
20. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated October 2, 1877.
21. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated October 5, 1877.
22. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated October 6, 1877.
23. List of witnesses furnished board October 6, 1877.
24. Letter of "Very careful observer," dated October 7, 1877.
25. Letter Dr. G. S. Palmer, dated October 8, 1877.
26. Letter of Dr. G. S. Palmer, received October 8, 1877.
27. Letter of Dr. G. S. Palmer, dated October 8, 1877.
28. Call of F. E. Felton, dated October 10, 1877.
29. Call of F. E. Felton, dated October 12, 1877.
- 29½. Piece of paper filed to show size of piece of beefsteak furnished for breakfast.
30. Call of F. E. Felton, dated October 13, 1877.
31. Letter of Mrs. A. O. Talbot.
32. Charge of F. E. Felton against Nancy Stafford, dated October 18, 1877.
33. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated —.
34. Statement of sales by Dr. Palmer, dated October 13, 1877.
35. Statement in relation to "slush fund," by Dr. Glennan, dated October 19, 1877.
36. Statement of amounts received from National Home for Disabled Soldiers for board.
37. Statement of amounts received from District of Columbia Commissioners for board.
38. Copy of letter addressed to J. R. Francis, October 19, 1877.
39. Letter of Robert T. Johnson, dated October 19, 1877.
40. Copy of letter addressed to Mr. Neely, clerk Treasury Department, October 29, 1877.
41. Letter of Allen Black, dated July 25, 1877.
42. Letter of J. H. McGinn, dated October 26, 1877.
43. Admitted draft of proposed agreement between American P. and P. Company and J. J. Calvert.
44. Letter of Sidney McFarland, dated October 29, 1877.
45. Call of F. E. Felton, dated October 30, 1877.
46. Affidavit of Robert F. Wheeler, dated October 22, 1877.
47. Catalogue of Howard University, 1871-'72.

48. Catalogue of Howard University Medical Department, 1877-'78.
49. Copy of Dr. Palmer's letter to O. S. B. Wall, dated October 7, 1876.
50. Letter of Dr. Palmer, dated November 1, 1877.
51. Copy of letter from Dr. E. Goerner to Dr. Purvis, dated September 13, 1877.
52. Statement of furniture, &c., in use by Medical Department, Howard University.
53. Letter of Dr. Palmer, dated November 3, 1877.
54. Letter of F. E. Felton, dated November 3, 1877.
55. Copy of contract for wood made July 21, 1871.
56. Letter of Dr. Palmer, dated November 7, 1877.
57. Statement of J. E. Butler, filed November 9, 1877.
58. Letter from F. E. Felton, dated November 8, 1877.

The stenographer's notes of the evidence are now being transcribed, and we are informed by the clerk having charge that they will be completed within five or six days.

We feel it our duty in concluding this report to bear testimony to the alacrity and willingness with which Dr. G. S. Palmer and his subordinates at the Freedmen's Hospital aided this board in its labors. Every possible facility was extended for a thorough investigation, and the demands made are but slightly evidenced by the documentary testimony herewith.

We are, sir, with much respect, your obedient servants,

T. B. HOOD.
GEO. EWING.
JNO. K. WALSH.

Hon. C. SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

Exhibit J. A. W., M. McK.

Q. That is the report furnished us by the Interior Department.—A. I said "I believed," not because I doubted it, but I have scarcely time now to look over all this document to see that it is the precise report. I have no doubt it is.

Q. The testimony taken in writing before you does not show the full testimony on which your conclusions were based?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were your conclusions also based to a certain extent upon your observations there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In any degree upon your judgment of the credibility of the various witnesses from their appearance and so forth?—A. I should say to a considerable degree.

Q. How soon after the appointment did you proceed with your duties?—A. I think within a week, perhaps within four or five days.

Q. Then it was the last of September that you commenced?—A. Yes, sir; about the end of that month.

Q. What did you find the condition of the hospital when you went to it?—A. I think we found it in as good condition as institutions of that kind ordinarily are, considering the character of the institution and the character of the inmates.

Q. What is the peculiarity of the character of the inmates?—A. They are largely from the lower orders of society; it is a free hospital, taking in all who apply, or rather all who are sent there. They represent as a rule the lower orders of society, the poorer classes, people who live in hovels, badly fed, clothed, and kept in every way.

Q. Do they come in there dirty or clean?—A. Dirty always, or nearly always.

Q. Did you have occasion to examine the food at that time given to the patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you present at any meal?—A. Yes, sir; I was present at a good many meals during the course of the investigation. The first thing we did was to inspect the hospital and inspect the kitchens and cooks and the food.

Q. Did you go there at a time breakfast was served by special arrangement?—A. I did not. That was done by Dr. Walsh.

Q. Did you find that the condition of the hospital improved as you proceeded with your investigation, or as a result of it?—A. It did not so occur to any of the committee, I believe; it certainly did not to myself.

Q. After you had completed your investigation and made the report, partly from your observation, partly from written testimony, and partly from other testimony, you handed that report in to the Secretary of the Interior, did you not?—A. Yes, sir; through our secretary. Dr. Walsh acted as secretary of the committee.

Q. I find here a memorandum under the head of "Investigation of Freedmen's Hospital":

Transcript of interview between the Secretary of the Interior and the Assistant Attorney-General of the United States for the Interior Department on the one hand, and the board of commissioners appointed to investigate the Freedmen's Hospital on the other, at the office of the Secretary of the Interior,

stating again the names of those who were present and their conversation [which will be found in the appendix to the testimony]. This seems to be written out very fully. Was a short-hand reporter present?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the object of the interview explained to you before you went?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know that a short-hand reporter would be present?—A. No, sir; I was not aware there was to be any short-hand reporter. I became aware of it after observing that our interview was being written down.

Q. Under those circumstances this interview took place?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know the name of the short-hand reporter who took down this interview?—A. I think it was a Mr. Mitchell.

THOMAS JONES (colored) sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Waiter.

Q. At what hotel are you employed?—A. The Ebbitt House.

Q. Have you ever visited the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir; I have been visiting there quite a while.

Q. For how long?—A. Since last June.

Q. All the time?—A. More or less.

Q. What brings you there?—A. I had a sick friend who was carried there from Fourteenth street in June.

Q. What ward is that friend in?—A. Number 2; Dr. Purvis's.

Q. Is it a male friend?—A. A gentleman.

Q. You have visited the hospital and that ward in order to see this friend?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often do you go?—A. During the time he was there sick I used to go every other day, and a while before he died I used to go there every day.

Q. From June to September you were there pretty often?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you know, from what you saw, with regard to that hospital, as to its cleanliness and the treatment of the patients?—A. I saw nothing that I could say was not correct with the hospital during the time I was going there. I saw that everything was clean and decent. The nurses seemed to be as attentive as they could be to the sick. When the doctors came in it seemed they would apply to the sick, and supply all their wants and wishes, so far as I saw of them.

Q. Did this friend of yours complain of the treatment there?—A. Not

at all. I never heard any complaint of his treatment there. He always said he was treated very well, and by the doctors he said he was treated very well, and the nurses also. Dr. Purvis, I believe, paid every attention to him all the time I was going there.

Mrs. AUGUSTUS GUSTHOFF sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. Where do you live?—Answer. Seventh street, No. 904.

Q. You are a married lady, I believe?—A. Yes, sir; my husband is here.

Q. Have you ever had occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. O, yes.

Q. What caused you to go there?—A. Last summer my nurse was there nine weeks.

Q. During what months?—A. She was there from the first of May until July.

Q. How often did you go to see her?—A. I cannot say how often. I was there several times. I never noticed how often I was there.

Q. What was her treatment there?—A. The nurse, when she came back, and all through the time, told me she was treated in all kindness, and she had everything she wished. Dr. Palmer was kind to her and Dr. Glennan the same, in every respect, and she was three years in our house before she was taken sick. We were willing, if she wanted anything, to give it to her without any pay for it, if she was satisfied there. We liked her very much. She is a colored girl. She said she could have everything she wanted, and Dr. Palmer came all the time in the evenings late to look at her; everything was just so perfect as she could wish it. She was taken very sick again two months ago. She had the pneumonia then; and our doctor, Dr. Behrend, told her it was more quiet in our house, and better for her than to go back again. I told her so, and she said, "Please send for Dr. Palmer or Dr. Glennan, and if those gentlemen tell me to go there, I will go right away." I sent in the morning and Dr. Glennan came by 12 o'clock, and he told her, "You had better come back again," and she was going there the other day with pleasure. From that time up to now I am going there myself every week, sometimes twice a week, and she is very well satisfied.

Q. What did you notice about the cleanliness of the ward?—A. I was there Monday and Friday, and several times Saturday. I think the place is as clean as anybody can wish it.

Q. Was it so last May and June?—A. It was just the same.

Q. You find no difference between now and then?—A. I cannot see that there is any.

Q. Did you ever see the food that was given to this girl?—A. I was there several times at supper, never at dinner.

Q. Was the food good?—A. Yes; I thought it was good enough for any person that was sick. Another lady was with me, and she said, "My Mrs. Gusthoff, how well off are the people here; they cannot wish a better home."

Q. Did you ever notice anything about the cleanliness of the bedding?—A. Yes, sir; my girl is so clean, nobody can be more clean than our Mary—the nurse I am speaking of—and she told me all the time that she got all the clean bed-clothing she wished, a good mattress, and everything just clean. She could not stand it there if it was not clean.

Q. You saw for yourself whether it was clean or not?—A. I did.

Q. Were the neighboring beds of the same character?—A. All over they were the same.

AUGUSTUS GUSTHOFF sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. You are the husband of the lady who has just testified?—

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a grocer. I keep on Seventh street, No. 904.

Q. Have you had occasion to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. I have had, numerous times.

Q. When?—A. I had to visit the hospital before our nurse became sick and was transferred to the hospital. From that time I visited her frequently during the week, sometimes three or four times.

Q. What did you observe with reference to the condition of the hospital?—A. I was in several other hospitals before, and I could not see any difference. The patients seemed to be clean in every respect, as far as I could see.

Q. How were the floors?—A. They were clean.

Q. Were you in any other ward than the one where Mary was?—A. I was in the men's ward. I believe it was in February. We had a little boy who was shot in the field while he was going from my house on business. I went out to the field and found him there, and asked for him to be admitted to the hospital. I immediately got permission, and the hospital wagon was sent out to bring the boy down. As soon as the boy came in Dr. Palmer and several other physicians came in and examined him and pronounced him fatally injured. He was brought out into the men's ward. I do not know the number of it. As far as I could observe there—I did not stay there very long—everything was very neat and clean.

Q. Who was that boy?—A. A boy I hired. He died that evening at six o'clock, I think.

Q. What has been your observation of the treatment of the patients by Dr. Purvis, Dr. Palmer, and Dr. Glennan; kindly or otherwise?—A. I have a store; a good many of the patients and inmates of that hospital come to my store, and I have not heard any complaints. Our nurse said she was very well pleased with her treatment. I often asked her whether she would not have a desire for some particular thing that I could bring her. She said she did not know; she could get everything she liked there. I sometimes brought her a little soup, such as she was used to eating in our house, and she relished it very much.

Q. Did you observe anything about the intercourse between the doctors and the patients, whether it was kind or otherwise, while you were in the hospital?—A. I had never occasion to meet Dr. Palmer while I was there, except when that little boy was hurt; then I saw Dr. Purvis and Dr. Palmer and Dr. Glennan, and several other gentlemen.

ALONZO BELL sworn and examined.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What position do you occupy?—A. Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Q. Did you have occasion at any time to visit the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you go there?—A. As near as I can remember, some time in August; I cannot fix the date.

Q. Who accompanied you?—A. The Secretary.

Q. Did you give notice to the physicians of your intention to visit it?—A. No sir.

Q. What did you find the condition of the hospital to be?—A. We found it in very good condition; everything seemed to be in order.

Q. Did you notice about the cleanliness of the floors and the beds?—
A. I thought they were very clean.

Q. Did you examine the food of the patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you find out about that?—A. It seemed to be very good.

Q. Did you taste the bread?—A. I tasted the bread. The bread was sweet; as good as I have in my own house.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. This was before the examination instituted by the department?—
A. Before.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Is there any other statement with reference to the matter which you wish to make as to what you found there?—A. No, sir. All I can say is that we went there without giving notice to any one at the hospital, and when we got there we made a pretty thorough inspection of everything that there was there, and found every thing in apparently very good condition.

Q. When Mr. O. S. B. Wall was on the stand he testified with regard to calling upon an Assistant Secretary of the Interior to retain Dr. Palmer. Do you know O. S. B. Wall?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you the gentleman on whom he called with reference to that business, and what was the purpose of the call? In his testimony he says: "I told him there was a sort of movement on foot with reference to Dr. Palmer, and that I hoped he would be retained." He was in doubt whether his conversation was with you or your predecessor, Mr. Gorham, and was in doubt whether it was one year, or two years, or three years ago.—A. If it was two years ago, it must have been General Cowen.

Q. He described him as a man resembling Senator Allison?—A. Mr. Cowen resembles him something more than Mr. Gorham does. He had whiskers upon his face like Mr. Allison.

Q. Gorham was a large, sandy whiskered man?—A. A very large man. I think there is a little similarity between Cowen and Senator Allison.

Q. How long ago did Cowen leave there?—A. He left there in December, 1875.

Q. Who succeeded him?—A. Mr. Gorham.

Q. How long did he remain?—A. Until April 9, 1877.

Q. And you came in then?—A. I came in then.

Q. Then it could not have been to you?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you do not remember any such conversation?—A. I am quite certain he never made any recommendation of that kind to me.

Dr. C. B. PURVIS recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Something has been said in the testimony in regard to the treatment of a man named McGuire, and also a patient by the name of Wilmot. Do you remember those patients?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. You can make any statement you wish.—A. I am glad of an opportunity to answer what has been said in reference to those two men, as an impression has gone abroad and been circulated in the papers that I was cruel, and this man McGuire has been spoken of as the person to whom I was so. I may say that about ten years ago McGuire was taken to the Freedmen's Hospital to be treated for rheumatism of one

of his ankle-joints. In a little while caries of the bones developed, and it was evident that the limb would have to be amputated to save his life. He got an idea into his head that I caused those bones to die by tricking him; and I may mention here, by way of parenthesis, that that is not an uncommon thing. We have to-day a woman who thinks she has been tricked and has tadpoles in her arms and head, put there by two physicians formerly connected with the hospital; and I have also under my care to-day a man suffering from frost-bite of the great toe, and about two weeks ago he created some sensation because, in washing his old clothes, there were found in one of his pockets a rag containing some teeth, some toe-nails, and a snake, which he had there to keep off this trick. So that opinion prevails. When this man McGuire was admitted, on his back and chest he had some cœloid tumors. He got an idea that those on the chest were brought there by my pinching him. I do not know how he got the impression; in the same way, I presume, as he got that about his foot. I never attached any importance to it. I thought it was quite a joke, and always treated it as such, and used occasionally to joke him about it. I never heard any more about those tumors. He was in my care some years, I should say six or seven years, until he appeared as a witness in a recent investigation. I shall have to go through that to explain this matter as it should be. Then he swore that I brought those tumors on him by scratching him with a lead-pencil over his bald head. I do not know how he got the impression about the lead-pencil (he changed it from pinching to a lead-pencil) other than this: Once I was showing him to some of the students, and they asked me how I would treat such a case, and I traced out an elliptical incision. That may have been it.

To show you that there is nothing in that, the prosecution, as they termed it, brought forth one of my nurses, who was certainly a very good nurse, and a man whom I did think a great deal of, to sustain the assertions made by this man McGuire; and you will observe, if you look over his testimony, that he swears those tumors were on him before I ever saw him, when he bathed him, which is certainly the fact. No tumors of such a character could be brought on by any such means.

McGuire also testified that on one occasion I pulled him from the window, and his testimony is nearly correct in what he states about that matter, though he has not been before you. I understand he said that I once ordered him to be removed from a window, and when the nurse went to remove him he resisted him, and I pulled him away from it. That statement was also made by the nurse Harcomb, who failed to state the entire truth, either before this committee or before the Secretary, who took particular pains to examine him on that point. He said I pulled McGuire from the window on to the floor. That is not true. This man McGuire at times was very violent. On one occasion he was sitting by the window looking into the public street, making a great deal of noise, attracting a good deal of attention. I asked him to desist, and then as he did not, I told my nurse, William Shannon, to remove him. When the nurse went to remove him, he became very violent, and seized the nurse's arm and attempted to bite it. He would have bit him, but as he sprang forward, I caught him by the coat-collar and pulled him back to his seat, and being a very heavy man, weighing I should say over 200 pounds, the little ordinary chair upset, and the only person hurt was myself, as he mashed my foot a little. That is all there was in it. I then transferred him to another ward, as he was not sick at the time. I think that was three years ago.

Q. Something was said by Harcomb about your striking him on the head with a stick.—A. That is entirely false. In looking over Harcomb's testimony I find he makes that such a little trivial matter that he will not say I ever struck McGuire or hurt him. I have not the faintest recollection of even playing with him or even tapping him, as he says, in the gentle manner he describes, which seems to be exceedingly gentle. What I did some five or six years ago in joking with my patients I cannot call to memory; but I doubt the statement for this simple reason: I have in my employ the step-son of Harcomb, and he told his son some three or four days before he was a witness that Felton had got McGuire, or was going to have McGuire swear that Dr. Purvis struck him; and said "that would be a very mean thing; the doctor never struck McGuire in his life." I am also told by—

Q. We will not go into hearsay evidence.—A. Very well. You asked me about Mr. Wilmot. I understand that Mr. Harcomb swore that a man by the name of Wilmot was under my care for two days, and that I did nothing for him, and he died. There is not a word of truth in it. Wilmot was admitted to the hospital on the night of the 21st of December, 1874. I did not remember anything about the case, but Dr. Glennan, when I told him about the testimony of Harcomb, looked up the register, and this (exhibiting) is the book that contains all the prescriptions written monthly.

Q. Is this the book of original entry?—A. Yes, sir. This page (indicating), with this large cross, contains the treatment of Wilmot, showing that he was prescribed for nearly every day up to the day he died. The day before he died I had a consultation with Dr. Glennan. That day I mopped out his throat with nitrate of silver. Very few persons, if any, get over œdema of the glottis. It is a fatal disease. That was his disease. Here are those prescriptions. He died on the 1st of January. I believe Harcomb, in his testimony, admits that his throat was mopped out on Friday, and he died on Saturday. Very likely he did before I got there in the morning. I do not remember it; it is some years ago; but this book contains the prescriptions, and they tally exactly with the time the man was admitted and the time he died, and what I gave him, and Dr. Glennan can corroborate my statement as to his holding consultations with me over that patient.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. How long was he there?—A. He was there from the night of the 21st of December, 1874, until the 1st of January, 1875.

Q. Seven days?—A. About seven days, and he had six prescriptions in that time, the beef-tea and mucilaginous drinks never going on the books. I do not know that it is necessary to state his treatment.

Now, one word in reference to this man Harcomb, to show that he was made to swear. He swore, among other things, during the investigation that I was not his friend, and being cross-questioned by Mr. Riddle, he said I kept him down; and the mode of my keeping him down was that I did not make Dr. Palmer increase his wages. This man Harcomb has an impression that he should receive \$40 a month. He has only had that impression since the investigation commenced last October. And yet he admits that for thirteen years he was under my care. I never spoke a cross word to him, and that for twelve years I had attended his family, his first wife and her children, and his second wife, and never charged them anything; that when he was in trouble, having had some difficulty with a woman, I paid his lawyer; another time I plead his case before a magistrate, when he was rearrested for

the same thing. He was evidently made to swear all he did swear. He swore on that same occasion that Dr. Palmer discharged him and took him back again the same day. There is not a particle of truth in it. I was present and heard all the conversation between him and Dr. Palmer, and I know it to be incorrect. I have never been cross or rough or cruel to a single patient during my thirteen years in the Freedmen's Hospital. That can be said and thoroughly substantiated. Dr. Glenan has been my superior officer all that time, and when he comes on the stand I should like to have him testify in reference to it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Something has been said in reference to the discharge of a man by the name of Potter and of his being received again into the hospital. What was the occasion of that discharge?—A. I discharged Mr. Potter twice. I was out of the city in July, and returned, I think, the 3d day of August. I found Mr. Potter in my ward; I treated him to the best of my ability; he improved. After he had been under my care a little while he wanted me to give him something to do. I assigned him to the mess-house to assist the waiters in putting food on the table. Then, as the hospital was very full, and as he had improved a good deal in health and was going about, I said to him, "I shall have to make some discharges; I wish you would get a place." Said he, "I expect to go to Mr. Moses's, and I think I can get a place in about two weeks." I gave him a suit of clothes, and gave him two weeks to get a place in. At the end of the two weeks he failed to get a place and I discharged him. I did not know at that time that he was at all interested in the investigation *pro* or *con*. He came back the same day with a letter from the Interior Department—I do not know by whom written—saying, "this man should be readmitted, as he is wanted as a witness." He was taken in, and in a few days he became sick again. I may say here that he suffers with tubercular deposits in the lungs, and has some gastric trouble. I took him and treated him, and during the month of November the nurses reported to me that he was in the habit of swearing at them, and swearing at the cooks and the other patients. After I had completed my round in the ward, approaching his bed and prescribing for him, I said to him, "Mr. Potter, I am told that you are very profane in this ward, and that is against my rules." He denied it. I merely cautioned him; told him not to repeat it, or if he did I should have to discharge him. That was on a Friday, I think. On Monday, coming up the steps to my ward, I met the nurse, who said that Mr. Potter had been more profane than usual, and made a great many disparaging remarks about myself as well as the cooks and nurses who were attending him. Mr. Johnson, the man who preferred the charges, was standing near by, within a few feet, and he came to me and said, "What the nurse reports to you is true, sir; you cannot, if you have any self-respect, keep Mr. Potter in this ward." So, after I went in the ward—Mr. Potter was not there—I took down his card, and when he came in I told him I was compelled to do what I did not want to do, discharge him for disobedience. Mr. Felton then became very violent and very insulting, and said he would take issue with me, and he would see the Secretary, and he wanted to know why I did not discharge him. I would have done that, but he took advantage of his condition; he knew that as he was a paralyzed man I could not do it. Mr. Potter went away. I learned in the course of the day that O. S. B. Wall and Mr. McFarland had gone with him to the Secretary to have him returned. Mr. Johnson also went down to see the Secretary of the In-

terior to tell him that I was justifiable in discharging him. I understand from Mr. Johnson that he told the Secretary so; in fact I have been told by others who were present that he did so tell the Secretary. Dr. Palmer, I believe, saw the Secretary the next day also, and told him in reference to it. In three days he was returned, but not to my ward. He comes in the ward at nights, however, to meet Mr. Felton and Mr. Johnson, but does not come when I am there. There was no reason why Potter, while he looks badly, should have been kept in the hospital. There is not a day or night, it matters not how stormy it is, that that man does not go out. During the investigation, though he claimed to be sick, I knew on one occasion that he went out at 10 o'clock at night with Johnson and others in a carriage during a fearful storm, and did not return until 3 o'clock in the morning. In fact, they had their full swing at the hospital at that time, and have now pretty much.

Q. While the committee do not assume to be judges of the proficiency of doctors in their profession, still, where testimony affecting them is given in, it is only just to them that we should direct their attention to it. Robert T. Johnson testified on the day we examined him at the hospital:

I am to-day worse than I was when they commenced to treat me. I insisted that the doctors should examine my rectum. I thought something was wrong with it. I commenced to pass blood the last two or three days. I told the doctor I was not going to suffer longer, and intimated I would get an outside physician. So he examined my rectum and found my bowels all ulcerated; so he told me; and now he is treating me for that. That is all I know about it. I never knew before. He said he thought it was inflammation of the urethra. He was not sure; he only thought it was inflammation of the urethra. I think, though, that they have got to it now, because I was satisfied it was in my rectum.

What do you say with reference to that?—A. That is partly true, and part is not. It is true that on that day I examined his rectum; but I had been treating his rectum some little while before that. Mr. Johnson's disease is not a disease of the rectum at all. He is there a victim to successive attacks of gonorrhœa. He has chronic inflammation of the bladder and also an ulcerated condition of the urethra. The condition of the rectum has been brought about by tenesmus—straining; it has caused a varicose condition of the veins of the lower portions of the bowels, which recently has ulcerated. I am still treating him for his bladder trouble. In fact, he has been treated for that trouble by the best physicians in this city. Dr. Garnett, and Dr. Ford Thompson, and Dr. J. Harry Thompson have all treated him for the same purpose. He has with him a number of bougies which they gave him or got him to buy. The way I came to examine his rectum was this: he passed some blood, I think, the morning before your committee came there, and I wished to make an examination of it; but that is only a sequel to his other troubles. I do not believe he will ever recover. He has had gonorrhœa, according to his own statement, three times. He tells a very disgusting tale about it. I think he is a used-up man from his excessive venery. There is no question about that. I think this morning or yesterday morning he had a little hemorrhage from the urethra.

Q. You are satisfied that the diagnosis you gave of his treatment is what is necessary in his case?—A. Yes, sir. I have consulted the other physicians about it. Dr. Glennan is attending him as well as myself; we all agree about that. When he first came into the hospital we thought he had what we call a chancre in the urethra, but I soon discovered that was a mistake. He could not have had a chancre there unless he had the constitutional effects of syphilis, which he has not. This is the result of a series of attacks of gonorrhœa. He will never recover, I am

pretty sure. I have exhausted my skill and consulted others. I made his case a special study.

Q. Mr. Felton, in his testimony, speaking of what is the matter with him, says that the necessity of his being there rather than at Providence Hospital is to have a nurse to rub him; is that so?—A. No, sir; the rubbing which is now done for him was only resorted to within the last few months. Mr. Felton has paralysis of the lower extremities, paraplegia, and I think his disease is the result of excessive venery. That is my judgment about it. I have a similar case in the hospital of a man by the name of Wallace, who makes a free confession about it; and taking the history of the case, I can come to no other conclusion than that. Mr. Felton also suffers from incontinence of urine. Taking these things together I have no doubt that his disease is the result of his excesses.

Q. What would be the effect of putting rubber-blankets in the bed over the mattress where a person is so afflicted?—A. They smell in a very little while, and becomes very offensive indeed—extremely so.

Q. What would be the effect of patients sleeping on rubber?—A. There has been a variety of opinions about that expressed in the profession. Some think it is injurious to health, and I have seen it written somewhere—I do not remember just now where—that paralysis may be brought about from that cause, but I hardly think so. I know it becomes a matter of annoyance. I am not prepared to say whether it affects the health injuriously or not.

Q. What other remedy is there besides putting rubber between the mattress and the patient?—A. There is none. The treatment is to use rubber for that purpose. Sometimes we use oil-cloth, but that decays very rapidly. The only other course is constant changes of clothing and bedding.

Q. Do you constantly change the beds?—A. Yes, sir; all the time. Mr. Felton wets his bed every night—wets all his clothing—wets on the floor. In fact he is a very filthy man in his habits. He is a great annoyance.

Q. You do change his bed continually?—A. Yes, sir. The nurses take more pains with him than with any other man in my ward.

Q. And as a physician you think that is better than putting rubber under him—better for him?—A. He has a rubber bag for the purpose of catching the water in, but he will not wear it. He purchased that himself. It soon becomes offensive, and he does not like the odor of it.

Q. In the interest of cleanliness, then, it is better to change the bed?—A. Yes, sir; continually. The effluvia he complains of arises from himself.

Q. Has Johnson ever complained to you with reference to his meat being spoiled?—A. No, sir; I had but one conversation with Johnson in reference to that. In the early part of September, after Dr. Palmer returned from his vacation, he received a letter that was from the Interior Department, forwarded to him, I believe by the chief clerk, which had been written by Robert T. Johnson, setting forth that the meat was rotten, &c. He read the letter to me, in fact he gave it for me to read. We could not imagine who this man could be. I said I had a Robert Johnson in my ward; I would go there and see if he was the man. I went there and called him into a side room and showed him the letter and asked if he wrote it. He said "yes." I then said to him, "Mr. Johnson, you know there is not a word of truth in it; if you had any spoiled meat why did you not call my attention to it." Said he, "I did not choose to." Then he was a little saucy about it for the moment. I reported to Dr. Palmer. He came there and brought Dr. Glennan with

him, and we had a talk about it. Dr. Glennan asked him who saw this spoiled meat besides himself. He said a man by the name of Bell and the nurse. He referred to sour bread in the letter. We called in the man Bell and the nurse Lucius Harcomb. Harcomb said that one or two pieces of meat were a little tainted during the summer, but as it was a matter of minor importance he did not think it was worth while to call my attention to it. Dr. Palmer then asked him "what instructions have you from Dr. Purvis?" Said he, "he told me always to report to him everything that went wrong in the ward." Johnson then attempted to browbeat the man by saying "O, you are afraid to tell the truth; you are afraid the doctor will discharge you!" Dr. Palmer replied, "O, no; I will not discharge Lucius for telling me what was going on wrong; I would discharge him if he would not tell me." That was the time Lucius said the doctor discharged him, and that was the only conversation I had with him about it.

Q. Did Johnson make any statement to you about how Calvert came to be a witness for him?—A. Yes, sir; it came about in this way. There was a man in my ward named William Johnson who had hip-joint disease, as it is called, caries of the pelvis, caries of the head of the femur. He died. His wife used to go there every day to see him. This Robert Johnson made the acquaintance of his wife during her visits there. During the month of December, I think it was, she came to see me, and wanted me to prescribe for her. He saw her come in and go away. He sent for me to go in the ward, he wanted to see me. When I went there I found him a good deal excited. Said he, "Did Dr. Palmer keep Mrs. Johnson from coming here to see me?" Said I, "No." Said he, "I sent for you; I thought you would tell me the truth; he stopped Clagett the other day, and I thought he would stop this woman." Said I, "O, no, she came to see me, not you." "Well," said he, "That satisfies me, doctor, I am going down to see the Secretary about you; I have done you an injustice; I have been talking to Mr. Wall." Said I, "Have you? I did not know anything about it." "Yes," said he, "I find that I did not treat you properly; I am going to tell the Secretary so. These men here swore to things not true." Said I, "Did you do that? There is Mr. Calvert. He declared to me that before he would swear for any of you fellows, you would have to take up there by his force pump and make him do it." Said he, "He was not going to swear at first, but I will tell you; I told Calvert that I would go to see Secretary Schurz; I did go, and he gave me a letter which I brought up and read to Calvert, which said he should not be disturbed in his place; and then he was not only willing to swear, but he told us a great many other things that we never heard of before."

Q; Something has been said about Samuel Stewart being compelled to testify; what do you know about that?—A. I do not know as to that. Mr. Stewart made an affidavit before Mr. Cook in reference to the diet, cleanliness of the ward, &c. He was admitted to the hospital about two years ago, suffering from what I supposed to be scrofula. He got very much better, and I had him employed as an assistant nurse; but the very moment he got some money—as a holiday came on—he went out and contracted syphilis. Then I discharged him, and he has not been feeling very happy since. But he made the affidavit I have just referred to, and then he made another afterward denying that he knew what he swore to. Since you gentlemen have undertaken to investigate the hospital, he called me into the room one evening and commenced to cry; and said he, "Doctor, for God's sake, don't kill me; I did not mean to tell what was not true about you; here I am passing

blood from my bowels; Mr. Johnson has been passing blood from his bowels, and I am afraid you are going to kill me." "Why," said I, "nonsense, man." "Well," said he, "you wrote some medicine for me the other day to make me sleep, and it read on the bottle, 'take half at once, and if you do not rest in the course of two hours, take the other half;' I have never taken it, because it had in addition to that 'and this half will put you to sleep and you will never wake up any more.'" Going into the ward the next morning, I asked him for that bottle of medicine to see if any one, playfully, had written such a thing on it, and I found it was not on it. "Who told you such a thing?" I asked. Said he, "Mr. Felton told me; he read it to me; I cannot read, and he told me that was on the bottle"; and so it really seems that man believed I was going to kill him.

Q. For swearing against the hospital?—A. Only partly swearing against the hospital. As far as I was concerned, he was quite complimentary, I believe.

Q. Did Mr. Calvert ever do any work for you?—A. In 1876 Mr. Calvert did work for me about two hours. I had a water-pipe that ran along the ceiling of my cellar. I dug a trench with the assistance of my young man, and I wanted to have the pipe run under ground, as it would freeze where it was. I asked Mr. Calvert to come and unscrew it—it merely had to be unscrewed at each end—which he did. He came one night and unscrewed it, but did not finish it because I had not something in the shape of a U—I do not know what you call it—a screw to go on the end of it. So he deferred it until the next night. He came about half-past four o'clock each time, about the time I eat my dinner, and staid about an hour each time. I offered to pay him. He said he would not take any pay, "you prescribed for me and my family when they went to the hospital." So I felt grateful to the man, and in the course of a few days I bought two turkeys, and I took one out and presented it to Mr. Calvert for what he had done for me. He was not over two hours at my house. I was asking my wife about it the other day, and she said she thought it was one hour. I think it was nearly two hours.

Q. What do you know about any neglect to repair water-closets?—A. When Dr. Palmer was away last August, he left Dr. Glennan and myself in charge of the hospital. I took charge of Dr. Palmer's ward as well as my own. The water-closet in my ward was out of repair, and also one in Dr. Palmer's ward got out of order, and also part of the boiler arrangement in the kitchen. I ordered Mr. Calvert to fix those water-closets several times, and to fix the pipe in the kitchen. He took no notice of my order. I was virtually, I supposed, in charge of the hospital at that time. After giving him several orders, which he neglected, I asked Dr. Glennan to take the matter in hand, or if he did not I would have to go to the Secretary and get the man relieved. Dr. Glennan did take it in hand, and advised that he had better do it for his own sake; and at last he did fix the water-closet in Dr. Palmer's ward, and did fix the pipe in the kitchen; but my ward he neglected, but he fixed it a little while after Dr. Palmer returned. I had a very few patients at that time who needed to use that water-closet; I had another below it, so I had to lock it up. It is not true, as stated, that the water-closet could not be used all the time for the month of September and part of October; it was locked up by my order. It is not an uncommon thing for me to order my water-closet to be locked up. I have to drive a certain class of patients down stairs, who are too lazy to go down stairs, and prefer to use the water-closet. The patients that are confined to

their beds could not use that water-closet anyway, and, at that time, I had quite a number in bed. They use the bed-pans and use the buckets. I do not think I had over three or four persons that needed to use that water-closet, which was locked up. We often have to do that to get them in the habit of going down stairs. Nearly every man in the place would use it if we did not lock it, and stand on the seats and make it very filthy. That is not uncommon.

Q. I think something has been said about your having had a cow there, and having sold it, and of its having been fed at government expense while there. What is the truth about that?—A. I had a cow there. I testified about her before. I sold that cow on the 4th of May, though I see in the testimony of Mr. Johnson he says that, when he came, there were three or four cows there, and he came on the 11th of July. My cow was sold on the 4th day of May and removed on the 7th. She never ate a morsel of government feed. Dr. Glennan has most of the receipts for the feed we purchased from the feed-stores near the hospital, and some I bought in the market.

Q. Do you want to say anything further with reference to the bones dug up by Banks?—A. I saw in the newspapers I was present when Banks dug up a cart-load of bones, and the policemen were there, and Dr. Keenè, of the board of health, and the coroner. I must state that Dr. Palmer did not know, neither did any of us know, that there were any bones buried on the place even for students, and he decided to have every place dug up unearthed and the bones taken away, and he ordered me to superintend it, and I did. There were three places in which bones had been buried. I staid there and assisted Banks to take them up. No one saw what we took up, because I held the little bag myself, and did not allow a patient to come around. I did not want to create any excitement. There were a few long bones belonging, as I have understood since, to one of the lady students who graduated a year or two ago, not enough to fill an ordinary market-basket. This "cart-load" is a pure fabrication.

Q. Do you remember the visit of Secretary Schurz and Assistant Secretary Bell to the institution?—A. Yes, sir. During the middle of August last they came out about twelve o'clock one day, to my surprise, and said they wanted to see the hospital—wanted to see everything about it. I showed them from top to bottom—a great many patients were about—all the water-closets, all the store-rooms, packing-rooms, and everything.

Q. The food, &c.?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. Schurz took down the bread, pulled a piece of it from the middle of the loaf, ate it, and said to Mr. Bell, in my presence, "That is good bread." He looked also at a piece of meat on the table. He came too late to see the dinner; they were just through. He did not find us in our cleanest time. The next day I went to see Assistant Secretary Bell and met Mr. Schurz also. He was very cordial and polite. I asked Mr. Bell what brought him there. He said they had received a letter from a man named Freas, and asked me if I knew anything about him. "Yes, sir," I said, "I discharged him three times; he had three discharges, but came back; he would get drunk. The last time he jumped the fence and never came back." I asked how they were pleased with the hospital. The Assistant Secretary said he was very much pleased with the hospital; he was thoroughly and completely disabused. That was all that was said.

Q. It was testified by Mr. Felton that A. G. Wall was a drunken man, and was discharged from the hospital?—A. That is not true. Mr. Wall resigned of his own accord to devote himself to the milk business. His

wife spoke to me some weeks before that, saying that he intended to resign, and he did resign. Dr. Palmer has his resignation.

Q. Is he a man who gets drunk?—A. No, sir. I have known him once or twice to drink some liquor, but never knew him to be a drunken man.

Q. He was not discharged for any reason?—A. He was not discharged for any reason, but resigned himself.

Q. Do you know O. S. B. Wall?—A. Very well.

Q. He testifies in reference to several conversations with you and about you. Did you have any conversations with him?—A. A good many about the hospital.

Q. Do you remember a conversation with him in June last in regard to Dr. Palmer?—A. Yes, sir. On my way to the hospital one morning in June, I think the latter part of June, he stopped me—my driver was with me—and said he, “Doctor, I want to thank you for the many little acts of kindness you have done for me; but for your friend there, Palmer, I intend to go for him and break him up; he reduced the price of my milk yesterday from 38 to 35 cents, and I intend to go for him.” I remarked, in a jocular manner, “You are harmless, Wall, you can’t do much hurt.” It was in June I had that conversation.

Q. In your conversations with him did you have any talk with him as to the parties that furnished meat to the hospital?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was it?—A. I think a few weeks after Dr. Palmer was appointed he stopped me on my way to the hospital and had a talk about the patronage. He wanted the privilege of furnishing the meat, the groceries, and the wood, and he offered to make it a profitable thing to me if I would control Dr. Palmer. There was at that time, there seems to be yet, an impression that I could control the action of Dr. Palmer. It is news to me. I never pretended it. He said to me, “You can get your meat for nothing and your groceries for nothing if you do that.” He said that three times during that year. The last conversation I had with him about it was in July, I think the 4th day of July last. He stopped me and said, “Why didn’t you give your friend Eggleston, the butcher there, the contract for meat? You profess to be a great friend of Eggleston.” Said I, “So I am; but my friend did not happen to bid low enough; that was the reason he did not get it.”

Q. Dr. Augusta made a statement which seemed to imply cruelty to a lying-in woman at the hospital. He stated that he did not know the name of the woman. The case that he referred to and described was of a woman in convulsions, where the child was taken from her by violence, a roll of cloth being put around the neck and your putting your foot against the person of the woman and pulling the child out, when he recommended cutting the child to pieces. Do you remember any such case?—A. Yes, sir; I heard his testimony. I may say in a general way that the whole statement was gratuitous. There is a grain of truth in it merely. I think it is about a year ago, I should say in the month of February last year, when I was called in the middle of the night to go to the Freedmen’s Hospital to attend a patient, a woman in confinement. I took my instruments with me and went out there. I spent the rest of the night with that woman. I had a consultation I think that night with Dr. Glennan, but I shall not be too sure about that, and a consultation with Professor Graham, who happened to be at the hospital that evening lecturing. We did all we could to relieve the woman. She was about coming down with labor. The convulsions, however, did not cease. It was in Dr. Palmer’s ward; and she was Dr. Palmer’s patient, in fact, but we did not send for him, because we could manage the case with-

outhim. Next morning he came, and Dr. Palmer thought it best to deliver the woman at once, which, after consulting with Dr. Glennan and myself, we agreed to. We thought she should be delivered. The *os uteri* was dilated; and that was the proper treatment. While Dr. Palmer was applying the forceps, Dr. Augusta, who was always late at the hospital, came in and merely looked on. The statement that he made the suggestion that we destroy the child or perform craniotomy is news to me. I never heard it until I heard him swear to it here the other day. But if he had made such a suggestion we certainly should have taken no notice of it, because no man in his senses would think of performing craniotomy when you can deliver a woman by the forceps. What he said about the forceps slipping is not exactly correct. I had left there a new pair of forceps, supposed to be an improved forceps, and Dr. Palmer applied them. He was not long at it. It is always a little trouble to apply a pair of forceps, especially as high up as that child was. They sprang. Then he took them off and applied another pair of forceps, which we had in the hospital, and delivered the child's head. The operation is considered, as a rule, over when the head of the child is delivered. It requires no force whatever to deliver the body, as a rule. In the vast majority of cases—I should say in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred—the child would be born without any one touching it. It requires no force. I was standing behind Dr. Palmer; Dr. Glennan was up supporting the woman, and I had a towel in my hand. I merely received the child in the towel. The head was slimy. I took hold of it—it required no force whatever—and merely received the body. Dr. Palmer really delivered the child. Dr. Augusta's statement is that when the forceps slipped I applied the towel to the neck of the child and then put my foot against the body of the woman, and with my strength delivered her. In the first place it is a physical impossibility to put a towel, or anything else, around the head of a child *in utero* in the cavity of the pelvis. After the head of a child is delivered there is no necessity for any force. As to his recommending craniotomy, as I have just said, that was a silly proposition which would not be justified by any one; in fact, it would have been malpractice to attempt to destroy a child. Anticipating that that question would be asked, as I was present and heard his testimony, I have brought with me two authorities. I could have brought more. I have here the work of Dr. Bedford, who is the leading obstetrician of this country, professor of obstetrics in the University of New York. I have also the work of Dr. Churchill, who is the leading obstetrician of the English school. These two works are authority.

Q. Let the committee understand what they say about that.—A. I will first give you Dr. Churchill's statistics. It will take but a moment to read what he says in reference to craniotomy.

Now, in craniotomy, all the children are destroyed, and one in five of the mothers is lost, whereas we have seen that by the forceps we save four out of five of the children, and twenty out of twenty-one of the mothers. If we had more minute reports, the success would undoubtedly appear much greater.

The special *advantages* of the forceps are said to be—

1. That they are easily applied.
2. That their powers are calculated to attain the object for which they are used.
3. That they do this by imitating the natural powers.
4. That they aid the expulsive efforts of the uterus better than any other instrument, and supply their place, which no other instrument can.
5. That they are less liable to slip than the vectis.
6. That they are attended with less fatal consequences than the perforator and crotchet.

And then he speaks about the blessings of the discovery of the forceps. I may say that Sir James Simpson also is so much in love with the

forceps that he thinks craniotomy should be abandoned altogether, although Churchill and others differ with him as to that. Dr. Bedford has such radical notions about that that I would like to read what he says; it is only a few lines:

In truth, it needs some nerve, and, for a man of high moral feeling, much evidence as to the necessity of the operation, before he can bring himself to the perpetration of an act which requires for his own peace of mind the fullest justification. He who would wantonly thrust an instrument of death into the brain of a living fœtus would not scruple, under the mantle of night, to use the stiletto of the assassin; and yet how frequently has the child been recklessly torn piecemeal from its mother's womb, and its fragments held up to the contemplation of the astonished and ignorant spectators as testimony undoubted of the operator's skill! O, could the grave speak, how eloquent, how damning to the character of those who speculate in human life would be its declarations! Such, gentlemen, was my language in 1844; and now, in 1861, with a more matured judgment and a riper experience, I am, if possible, the more strengthened in my convictions.

Speaking of the case of puerperal convulsions, he says:

When it is practicable, there can be no doubt that the important indication—indeed, the very best practice in convulsions at the time of labor, is to deliver the patient. Some authors recommend *version* when the head is at the superior strait, and the mouth of the womb in a condition to justify this operation. With this view, under certain restrictions, I coincide. If you will permit me to express a positive and emphatic opinion on this point, it is, *that under no circumstances should version be attempted in puerperal convulsions, unless the patient be previously placed under the full influence of anæsthesia*, and for the following reasons: 1. The very introduction of the hand into the uterus constitutes an exciting cause, which would almost certainly evoke the convulsive paroxysm; 2. The manipulations necessary to accomplish the delivery would so irritate the organ as to subject, through a repetition of the convulsion, the life of the mother to the most serious peril.

The two next alternatives are the *forceps* and *crotchet*.

And what he says about *crotchet* craniotomy I have just read. He might have added that the danger in using *version* also would be the rupture of the uterus. This woman had puerperal convulsions, and she was in a comatose condition; and Dr. Guizot, the leading French authority, says we should always use forceps on such occasions. I may say here, as Dr. Augusta mentioned that the woman died, that one woman out of four that have puerperal convulsions always dies. There is about one woman in 500 that has the convulsions. Of those who have the convulsions from uremic poison, I do not know that any are saved; if so, the percentage is very small. Indeed, the great majority of puerperal convulsions do not result always from albuminuria or Bright's disease. The uremic poison, which is the secret of the condition, results from a variety of causes, such as foreign substances, overloaded stomach, reflex action, irritation of the nervous system, &c., but this woman had uremic poison, and she died necessarily. I may say, if I be allowed, as that statement of Dr. Augusta was circulated, as it seemed to me, with a great deal of zeal by the newspapers, who appear to take particular pleasure in publishing all that is bad and very little that is good in the investigation, and to the injury of my reputation, that I think a man who lives in a glass house should not throw stones. Last year he wanted Dr. Palmer to castrate a simple-minded man that we had there, because he was addicted to onanism. Of course, Dr. Palmer did not take any notice of the suggestion. The patient had been there some years. It seems to me that a man who makes the blunders that he does should not place his opinion in opposition to three physicians and the best authorities in the land, because surely, while he was making that statement, he could not have forgotten the fact that some five or six years ago he brought a private patient to the Freedmen's Hospital to operate upon her in the presence of the class for an ovarian tumor. He operated.

The tumor proved not to be an ovarian tumor, but a fibrous tumor of the uterus; and the woman never got off that operating table. I do not say this with any view of injuring Dr. Augusta, but it seems to me that it not only was unkind, but such a person was not the one to come here to make a false statement, because in this very case in which he recommended craniotomy, he never made an examination of the patient. I think Dr. Palmer and Dr. Glennan will testify to that fact. Dr. Palmer was operating when he came in. I do not know whether there was a deformity of the pelvis or anything about it. He came here to state that. He thought it would help him to accomplish the object he had in view.

Q. Did you ever have any conversation with Dr. Augusta in reference to the removal of Dr. Palmer?—A. Yes, sir. He came to my house on the second or third day of July, and said to me, "Dr. Purvis, you and I ought to have control of that hospital. I want you to run for Dr. Palmer's position, and I ought to be your assistant." I then said to Dr. Augusta that if there was to be any change I thought I was entitled to promotion. I had been there a long while and I was seeking to overcome the prejudice that existed in this community against me on account of my color; but I was entirely opposed to the removal of Dr. Palmer unless there was some cause for it, and I did not know any cause for Dr. Palmer's removal. I thought he was the right man in the right place. He came back in the course of a few days and said, "Well, if you won't run for it, I am going to," and then he went away and got up a petition, and went to see Mr. Douglass, Mr. John F. Cook, and Professor Wilson, and they all refused to sign it. Mr. Douglass said to him, "I want to talk with Dr. Purvis about that. I should like to meet Dr. Purvis at your house, with Mr. Langston, who seems to be very anxious to assist Dr. Augusta."

Q. You will speak of matters within your knowledge, unless you heard them from Dr. Augusta.—A. Dr. Augusta came to my house and said Mr. Douglass wanted to meet me at his house with Mr. Langston. I went there and met Mr. Langston. He staid there a few minutes, got tired of waiting for Mr. Douglass, and went away. In a few minutes Mr. Douglass came in, and the doctor told what he wanted. He said that Dr. Palmer did not appoint as many colored people to positions in the hospital as he should. He went on to state that he thought he ought to have the position, as I was not going to run against Dr. Palmer; that Dr. Reyburn was trying to get back, and he thought he ought to have it in preference to Dr. Reyburn. Mr. Douglass heard him through, and then asked me what I had to say about it. I told him that I did not think Dr. Palmer ought to be removed; there was no reason for appointing Dr. Augusta, and I was opposed to it. I said, "The statement that Dr. Augusta makes is not quite true; there were four physicians during the year, two colored ones and two white. We had a white clerk, who was the son of one of our graduates. We had a colored matron, and all the employés on the place were colored." So Mr. Douglass said to him, "Doctor, I am entirely opposed to any such arrangement," and he retired. Since then I have not had any conversation with him about it.

Q. Did you understand Dr. Augusta as claiming that there was any discrimination in the admission of people to the hospital on the ground of color?

A. I heard him say that the other day; but it is certainly not true. I should like to make a statement about that. There were seven hundred and sixty-three patients treated last year in the Freedmen's Hospital.

There were three hundred and seventy-one colored patients admitted and one hundred and twenty-nine white. There were some few white persons left over. I should say there were altogether about six hundred colored persons treated in the hospital and about one hundred and sixty-three whites, or enough to make up the seven hundred and sixty-three. I may also say that there were over 3,000 prescriptions written last year by Dr. Augusta for outdoor patients. We are not bound to write a single prescription for outdoor patients. That is merely a kindness on the part of Dr. Palmer, because the city ward physicians were abolished. There were not a hundred of these prescriptions given to white people. This year I have written myself not quite nineteen hundred, and I have not written fifty prescriptions for white persons. They are prescribed for, however, if they come there. That statement is about like the rest.

Q. Dr. Augusta seemed to think that you and Dr. Palmer had him unfairly discharged from the chair of anatomy in the university, and thereby accounted for some of the action against Dr. Palmer in this case. What is the truth in reference to that?—A. That is not true. Dr. Augusta was professor of anatomy about eight years. We always had some trouble every spring with the class about to graduate. They grumbled at the doctor's mode of teaching. In 1875 the faculty had a meeting. We had that year a rebellion on the part of the graduating class. They refused to be examined, or rather to be re-examined by Dr. Augusta; they had failed in the examination. The faculty had a meeting, and we wanted Dr. Augusta to exchange with Dr. Lyon, and to take the chair of materia medica. He declined to do so. The question of harmonizing the faculty was considered at that meeting. We then appointed a committee, consisting of Drs. Baxter, Augusta, and Lamb, for the purpose of coming to some understanding. They met again on the 12th of May, and reported that they failed to come to any understanding, and asked to be discharged. It was so ordered, and, on motion, the faculty voted that "the chairs be allowed to remain as they are for the present year." We could not get Dr. Augusta to consent to the change. We did not want to discharge him, but wanted him to take another chair. We tried the same thing a year ago last September, and then elected an assistant to the chair, Dr. Brackett, a young man of decided ability, and he refused to receive him. There came to be so much excitement about it on the part of the students, that this year we decided to recommend to the trustees of the university that he be changed to the other chair, which we did, and he refused to accept it. I may say here, however, that, at the faculty meeting, we said to Dr. Augusta, "You must be changed from the chair of anatomy; you can have any other chair you please. There is so much discontent on the part of the students this year that you must change." He would not do it, and we changed him, and then he refused to lecture any longer.

Q. Do you know Tom Johnson, a patient in the hospital, who is under some restraint?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long has he been there?—A. I should say eight or ten years. I do not remember.

Q. Was he one of the original inmates?—A. One of the old patients. He is a harmless person.

Q. He came in from the freedmen's camp?—A. Yes, sir. He belonged there, one of the original inmates.

Q. Is he accustomed to try to get into the beds of the boys, &c.?—A. He used to do that some time ago. He has not been under my care for three years.

Q. What precautions are taken to keep him from committing acts upon others?—A. The nurse restrains him. We lock him sometimes in the room at the end of the ward. He is often put in there and kept there.

Q. Is there any other place in the world where that being can go, if he is turned out?—A. No place that I know of. I do not think they would take him anywhere. He is perfectly harmless. He does not do any harm to anybody. I never heard of his hurting the boys. He used to tease them sometimes, but he does not do that now, because the boys are as large as he is, and he is quite a coward.

Q. You do the best you can?—A. Yes, sir. I do not think there is any trouble about it.

Dr. ROBERT REYBURN recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. I have here a monthly statement of the amount of flour used in the Freedmen's Hospital when you were in charge of it. Examine the list, if you please. [Handing list to the witness.] Explain how a larger number of barrels were used some months in proportion to the number of patients than others; for instance, why, in some months, there seems to be a slightly less number of patients and a slightly greater amount of flour used, and another month more patients and the reverse, and so on. How do you explain that?—Answer. In the first place, as a rule, there is more flour used in the winter months than in the summer months; that is, the men eat more in cold weather; and, of course, with such a number of persons that makes quite a difference. Secondly, it depends a good deal on the character of the patients. Where many persons on low diet, taking beef-tea and things of that kind, they eat very little solid food; and, of course, in that way you will use less flour, and the consumption of it will be less. If your patients that are brought in are brought in as very often patients are brought in there, that are not very sick, many of the colored people who come in would get well outside, except that they have not the means of nourishment, of being cared for; and that class, of course, really require very full diet, and receive it; and, of course, there is quite an amount of food consumed in that way.

Q. Your explanation would be, then, that a less number of patients might use a larger amount of flour owing to their requiring more flour for their particular ailments than even a larger number when of a different character of patients?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that would vary from month to month?—A. Yes, sir; if we had a number of cases of typhoid fever, they would not use so much solid food, but liquid food. Another way would be this, for the same system was adopted while I was in charge of baking the flour outside: sometimes at the end of the month there would be a little balance owing to the baker, or perhaps he might want the flour, and we would send the flour a little in advance of the first of the month. We would order it near the end of the month, and about the 28th of the month five barrels would be sent to him, and they would lap over to the next month.

Q. That would account for such irregularities, comparing one month with another, or even the number of patients?—A. Exactly; and then in winter, as a rule, the patients consume more, and in feeding two hundred or three hundred persons that would make quite a difference.

Q. Did you consider it an economical way of supplying bread to the hospital to have it baked outside, pound for pound?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You found it to be so in your experience?—A. When we adopted that plan, it was after, for several years, we had received bread from the commissary. After that was stopped we had to provide our own bread. We found, on calculating, that it would be much less expensive to have it done in this way than to employ a baker, build an oven, and have fuel and labor to attend to it. I think so still. It is decidedly economical.

Q. What authority had you for issuing to the children of the orphan asylum flour for their whole ration, or a large portion of the ration?—A. I have been looking over my papers, and I have found a copy of an order containing the law. You can refer to the law. This law was passed at my own request. I saw at that time Senator Wilson, late Vice-President. We were left in a dilemma, and the hospital would have been closed without the passage of this law, which you can easily refer to. The order reads:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, April 21, 1869.

[GENERAL ORDERS No. 39.]

The following acts and resolution of Congress are published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

[PUBLIC—No. 10.]

AN ACT relating to freedmen's hospitals.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the Bureau of Refugees and Freedmen is authorized and directed to continue the freedmen's hospitals at Richmond, Virginia; Vicksburg, Mississippi; and in the District of Columbia, including the asylum for aged and infirm freedmen and for orphan children: *Provided,* That the expense thereof shall be paid by the Commissioner out of moneys heretofore appropriated for the use of the bureau: *And provided further,* That said hospitals shall be discontinued as soon as may be practicable in the discretion of the President of the United States.

Approved, April 7, 1869.

By order of the Secretary of War.

E. D. TOWNSEND,
Adjutant-General.

I have here a copy of the manual issued to the officers of the Freedmen's Bureau, during the existence of the bureau, special order, War Department, dated January 21, 1867. Article 5 gives the ration, which it is not necessary to read, and then goes on to say:

The Subsistence Department, as may be most convenient or least expensive to it, and according to the condition and amount of its supplies, shall determine whether soft bread, or flour, or other component parts of the ration as equivalents, shall be issued.

In the issue of rations, as in the Army, the ration only composed certain parts of the food. In order to get other parts of the food, we had to draw the full amount of the ration and exchange that. For instance, butter is not in the ration, and if you wanted butter you had to draw an overplus you did not want of another article and exchange it for that. As we could not do that under the organization because the Commissary Department finally stopped that, they would not allow us to draw rations any more after the War Department ceased to issue to us, then we would use what we required in those articles, and the balance that was undrawn would go to purchase the other articles that we needed. This was the authority under which it was done.

Q. A large part of the ration is flour?—A. Yes, sir. We had authority,

provided the same value was given. It might be cheaper, for instance, in a certain part of the country to buy fresh beef than pork. We were allowed to substitute, at the same cost, any other meat we chose. We used to buy ham in the same way as a substitute for pork, so that we did not exceed the value of the ration at the time.

Q. What authority had you for including those children among the patients of the hospital?—A. This law, which mentions them specially, and I am cognizant of the fact, because I was the means of having the law passed—

Including the Asylum for Aged and Infirm Freedmen and for Orphan Children.

It was specially included in the law.

Q. Do you remember a man in the hospital by the name of Tom Johnson, an idiotic man, while you were there?—A. Yes, sir; very well.

Q. What were his peculiarities?—A. He was an idiot, and required constant looking after. He was troublesome, but never violent. He would wander about, and had to be looked after.

Q. Do you know how he came there?—A. My impression is that he came as one of the patients from Richmond.

Q. Is he a colored man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his age?—A. He must be, I suppose, 26 or 27 now. He has been there a number of years.

Q. Was he kept there under the Surgeon-General?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know any place where that being could go to if he was turned out of that institution?—A. No, sir; for this reason: the insane asylum here requires certificates from the physicians who send patients there that the men became insane while residents of this District, and we were unable to give an affidavit of that kind in regard to this patient, because he was idiotic when he came here.

Q. What would become of him if he were turned out in the street?—A. There is no place he could go to, as I suppose, unless the city authorities would take charge of him. There is no institution he has any claim on.

Q. The city authorities would have to return him to the hospital, would they not?—A. Certainly.

Dr. P. GLENNAN recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Question. Have you read the testimony of Dr. Augusta with reference to a confinement case in the hospital?—Answer. Not the whole of it. The substance of it I understand.

Q. Make any statement you wish about that.—A. In regard to that confinement case, I was present. Dr. Palmer applied the forceps to deliver the patient.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Whose patient was the woman?—A. Dr. Palmer's patient. Dr. Palmer applied the forceps and delivered the woman actually, that is the head, which completed the main part of the operation; and Dr. Purvis merely received the child; in fact, it required no force to deliver the body.

Q. Was any force used by him at all?—A. I think not. It was not necessary. When the head was delivered by means of the forceps the difficult part of the operation was completed.

Q. Now state generally as to Dr. Purvis's treatment of patients that fell under his charge?—A. As far as my observation goes, and I have seen him a long time, he is always kind and attentive to his patients.

I never heard of his being cruel to a patient. I do not believe it at all. I have been there with him a long time.

Q. Did you hear it for the first time in this investigation?—A. Yes, sir; for the first time since last October. There is no foundation for it whatever.

Q. No complaint was ever made to you by any patient?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Have you refused at any time to receive a patient transferred to your ward?—A. No, sir. I removed the man referred to of my own accord, without consulting Dr. Augusta. One Sunday afternoon, when Dr. Augusta was not there, the man was very sick; at least he had an abscess on his leg. I do not remember the day of the month now, of course, but it was on a Sunday afternoon. I had the patient removed to my ward, and he was kept there until he got better, and then was sent back again to Dr. Augusta's ward. In fact, other patients have been removed from that ward to the sick ward proper before and since. It is not at all unusual to do that.

Dr. G. S. PALMER recalled :

By Mr. SARGENT :

Question. You are at liberty to make any statement with reference to the matters which have been in testimony before the committee. After the close of the examination of patients and officers of the hospital (during which time you were not present), I requested you to be here when others were testifying, and I have also placed in your hands the testimony as it has been printed. Now, you can make any statement that you see fit that you think should be made in justice to yourself in the management of the institution.—Answer. I took charge of the Freedmen's Hospital March 20, 1875, as surgeon in charge. I could find no statute law by which I was to be governed in its management. The hospital had been established by the Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau, transferred by act of Congress from him to the Secretary of War, and subsequently, by the same authority, to the Secretary of the Interior; and it has been supported since 1872 by annual appropriations from Congress. I went to the Secretary of the Interior, soon after taking charge, for instructions. He gave me none, except this, that I must do the best I could with the institution, but "never exceed the appropriation." I was then left to follow precedents, customs, and my own judgment. I found some things which, in my opinion, needed to be corrected, and I corrected them; but in most respects it seemed to me that the hospital had been run satisfactorily to the government and to those having charge of it, and for the best interest of its inmates. Hence I continued its general management the same as I found it. I believed that the Congress desired that the greatest amount of good should be done to the greatest number of persons with the money which it had appropriated, and on this principle I have always acted.

The customs established in this hospital while it was under the Freedmen's Bureau and the regulations adopted by the Surgeon-General when it was under the Secretary of War lie at the foundation of its present management. I have continued about the same system of diet, with some improvements; I have employed the same cooks, the same nurses, the same employes generally whom I found there. I have the same system of admitting patients and of discharging them; the same system of reports; the same mode of keeping accounts and books which have served satisfactorily for years are in vogue there now.

No money passes through my hands. I approve the bills for all arti-

cles purchased and they are paid at the Interior Department every month, and the accounts are then considered to be closed for that month after that date. Besides this, by a recent order of the Secretary of the Interior, a full return of all property for which the surgeon-in-charge is accountable is made quarterly.

In making my purchases I have endeavored to keep up a healthy and continued competition between those persons furnishing the supplies, not allowing any man to feel that he had a monopoly of the trade, but that he must furnish good articles and at low prices if he would retain the business.

I herewith present a statement showing the number of barrels of flour used monthly at the Freedmen's Hospital from July, 1874, to February, 1878, inclusive, with the names of the parties from whom purchased and the average number of patients for each month; also, a statement showing the date of receipts of flour for the year 1877.

Statement showing number of barrels of flour used monthly at Freedmen's Hospital, from July, 1874, to February, 1878, inclusive, with names of parties from whom purchased.

Month and year.	Flour from W. M. Galt & Co.	Flour from Terry & Floeckher.	Flour from Barbour & Hamilton.	Total.	Monthly average of patients.
July, 1874	43			43	296
August, 1874	41			41	283
September, 1874	43			43	281
October, 1874	45			45	278
November, 1874	47			47	275
December, 1874	47			47	277
January, 1875	48			48	275
February, 1875	45			45	276
March, 1875	48			48	285
April, 1875	22	24		46	281
May, 1875	24	21		45	274
June, 1875	22	28		50	267
July, 1875		41		41	264
August, 1875		41		41	269
September, 1875	23	19		42	248
October, 1875	16	25		41	248
November, 1875	22	20		42	246
December, 1875	28	18		46	264
January, 1876	20	20		40	274
February, 1876	20	21		41	277
March, 1876	21	19		40	275
April, 1876	29	12		41	261
May, 1876	42			42	266
June, 1876	42			42	265
July, 1876	43			43	268
August, 1876	42			42	270
September, 1876	41			41	262
October, 1876	12		35	47	269
November, 1876	30		16	46	265
December, 1876	44			44	269
January, 1877	39		6	45	279
February, 1877	44			44	280
March, 1877	31		14	45	293
April, 1877	48		4	52	285
May, 1877	43			43	270
June, 1877	43			43	275
July, 1877	41			41	270
August, 1877	19			19	255
September, 1877	28			28	246
October, 1877	32			32	255
November, 1877	23			23	229
December, 1877	24			24	224
January, 1878	28			28	222
February, 1878	28			28	228

As to the apparent variation of the amount of flour used in different months with the same number of patients, it often happens that at the

end of one month the baker has received two or three barrels of flour more than he has returned bread for, which flour is used in the next month, and at the end of another month, perhaps, he may have furnished two or even three days' bread for which he has not received the flour. In this way a variation of five or six barrels may appear in the monthly statement when the same number of barrels are used each month. But experience shows that the same number of patients in a hospital will eat more bread in some months than they do in others, particularly where the state of the health of the patients is varying and where they are constantly changing, some going out and new ones coming in. The same is true of other articles of diet. More corn-meal is used some months than others for the same number of patients. Again it will be seen by reference to the annexed statement that in the month of July, 1877, 41 barrels of flour were purchased; but 12 of these were purchased on the 27th day of the month, and were, consequently, used in August, but in August only 19 barrels were purchased; now 41 and 19 make 60, and this divided by 2 gives the average for the two months at 30 barrels.

Monthly account of barrels of flour received from W. M. Galt & Co. for the year 1877, and dates of receipt, as per their bills.

Date.	Barrels.	Date.	Barrels.	Date.	Barrels.
January 3, 1877	1	May 7, 1877	15	September 4, 1877 ...	1
January 4, 1877	12	May 15, 1877	12	September 5, 1877 ...	12
January 12, 1877	1	May 18, 1877	3	September 12, 1877 ..	1
January 15, 1877	12	May 23, 1877	12	September 19, 1877 ...	13
January 18, 1877	3	May 28, 1877	4	September 27, 1877 ...	1
January 24, 1877	10				
	39		46		28
		June 2, 1877	12	October 3, 1877	12
		June 8, 1877	3	October 4, 1877	1
February 5, 1877	13	June 14, 1877	12	October 11, 1877	1
February 8, 1877	3	June 19, 1877	3	October 15, 1877	1
February 14, 1877	12	June 20, 1877	12	October 18, 1877	12
February 16, 1877	3	June 27, 1877	3	October 24, 1877	5
February 23, 1877	13			October 31, 1877	1
	44		45		33
		July 2, 1877	12	November 10, 1877 ...	13
		July 13, 1877	12	November 17, 1877 ...	1
March 14, 1877	12	July 23, 1877	4	November 20, 1877 ...	6
March 17, 1877	3	July 26, 1877	1	November 23, 1877 ...	1
March 24, 1877	12	July 27, 1877	12	November 27, 1877 ...	1
March 26, 1877	4				22
	31		41		
		August 2, 1877	1	December 4, 1877 ...	12
April 2, 1877	12	August 13, 1877	13	December 6, 1877 ...	1
April 11, 1877	36	August 24, 1877	5	December 13, 1877 ...	1
	48		19	December 19, 1877 ...	1
				December 22, 1877 ...	8
				December 24, 1877 ...	1
					24

On the 1st of July, 1877, I discontinued to issue rations to patients in quarters, and also to the children of the Colored Orphans' Asylum. They had always constituted a part of the Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum, but I did not drop their names from the rolls of the hospital till the 1st of August. I also carried the names of the patients in quarters to whom rations had been issued on the hospital rolls till the 1st of October, giving them an opportunity to come in when they chose. They all understood that they belonged to the hospital, and that that was their home, but they had been permitted to live out in consequence

of enjoying a large liberty and being quite as economical for the hospital.

Q. The act of April 7, 1869, "An act relating to freedmen's hospitals," provides "That the Commissioner of the Bureau of Refugees and Freedmen is authorized and directed to continue the freedmen's hospitals at Richmond, Va: Vicksburg, Miss; and in the District of Columbia, including the asylum for aged and infirm freedmen and for orphan children." That, as far as you know, is the origin of the custom of taking care of the children in connection with the Freedmen's Hospital?—A. That is the origin of it. When the quantities of flour used in a year, or in six months, are compared with other corresponding periods of time, the variation between the amounts used at the different times is very slight.

During the first two years and three months of my connection with this hospital, everything went on smoothly and pleasantly; scarcely a complaint was heard from any quarter; and from the many little compliments which I received, from various sources, I verily thought that I was managing the hospital exceedingly well. On the 1st of July last, Dr. A. T. Augusta was relieved from duty in the hospital, and I had ceased, about that time, to purchase goods of Charles Fink & Co., of which firm O. S. B. Wall was the principal partner, and I had also reduced the price paid O. S. B. Wall and othes for milk to 30 cents per gallon, which was the market price at that time. About this time, I found that there were some patients in the wards who seemed to be restless and uneasy, willing to find fault with what before had passed as good and satisfactory. I examined into the causes of the complaints as well as I could, and found them groundless; they seemed to proceed from chronic grumblers, of whom there are always more or less in a hospital. I took my summer vacation in August; on my return I found things much the same.

Q. How long were you gone?—A. I have forgotten whether it was twenty-five or twenty-six days.

Q. Had you leave of absence from the Secretary of the Interior?—A. I had leave of absence from the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. At what time did you go, and at what time return?—A. I think I went away on the 3d or 4th of August and returned in season to sign the bills for the month, about the 28th.

Q. Go on.—A. On or about the 14th day of September I received through the Secretary of the Interior a protest against the payment of William H. Hoover's bill for meat for the month of August, signed by Robert T. Johnson, with a request by the Secretary that I should investigate the matter and report, which I did, and the following is a copy of the protest and the report:

CORNER BEALL AND MONROE STREETS.,
Georgetown, August 30, 1877.

SIR: I protest against the payment of W. H. Hoover's bill for meat claimed to have been furnished by him to the Freedmen's Hospital for the current month, as such meat was of inferior quality, putrid, and unmerchantable, as can be proved if an investigation be instituted.

Very respectfully,

HON. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

ROBT. T. JOHNSON.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1877.

SIR: I have the honor to state that Robert T. Johnson's "protest against the payment W. H. Hoover's bill for meat furnished the Freedmen's Hospital for August, 1877,

alleging that the meat was putrid and unmerchantable," referred to me for report, has been received and a thorough investigation on the subject has been instituted. After a careful and searching inquiry into the matter, I find that no "putrid or unmerchantable meat" has been received at this hospital during the month of August, or any other month, either from W. H. Hoover or from any other person.

But it does appear that in consequence of the non-delivery of the ice in season, on two or three occasions during the hottest weather, some portions of the meat became slightly affected, and its condition escaped the notice of the steward, the cooks, the inspector of meats, and the waiters, and it found its way to the wards. A large majority of the witnesses examined testify that this has occurred only two or three times during all the hot weather; two of them say it has occurred oftener; but very many of the patients and some of the nurses have not noticed it at all, so that it appears that only a small portion of the meat cooked at any one time could have been affected, and that only slightly.

The imperative instructions to the steward, the cooks, the waiters, and the officer of the day (one of the physicians whose duty it is to examine the food), are now and always have been in this hospital, not to allow any improper food, or food improperly prepared, to pass to the wards, or to be served on the tables.

The ice company have been informed that negligence on their part to deliver ice in season will not be tolerated.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

HON. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior, Washington.

Several complaints were made about this time by F. E. Felton, which were carefully investigated, and the cause of complaints, if there were any, remedied at once. I felt somewhat uneasy, as these complaints seemed to be numerous and from unknown causes, and I asked several of the officers in the Interior Department to come out and visit the hospital. I think I asked the Secretary himself to come out, and some others, to pay us a visit. Things went on in this way for a while, and I asked the Secretary one day if he would appoint some person or persons to examine into this matter, and learn if there was any cause for these complaints. He informed me that he had already done so. I felt relieved, particularly after I learned, from the chief clerk, that the men appointed were considered to be honest and capable men, although I did not learn their names at that time. Soon after this, on the morning of the 8th of October, I was astonished and shocked on reading, in the National Republican of that morning, charges and specifications of the most extravagant and sensational character against me as surgeon-in-charge of the Freedmen's Hospital, signed by Robert T. Johnson. I have that paper here. This was the first time I had any knowledge of the existence of these charges. The paper was brought into the hospital that morning and freely circulated, and particularly certain credulous persons in the hospital who had had entire confidence in me were led to believe that I had done them a great wrong.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Were an unusual number of those papers brought to the hospital that morning, or was the ordinary number brought there?—A. I think it was an unusual number that was distributed. Everybody knew it before I got there. It was announced by the leaders of this opposition that a change was to be made in the administration of the hospital, and the employés were naturally willing to be the friends of the incoming administration. This I heard in various portions of the hospital. These charges and all other complaints against the management of the hospital have been thoroughly investigated by the committee then appointed by the Secretary. The result of their doings you have. As to the testimony of certain parties who have testified here, I would speak of that

of O. S. B. Wall. His testimony in this case seems to be of a character to break down the management of the hospital and to have me discharged from its management. I wish to say that when I took charge of the hospital, in March, 1875, I found him furnishing milk to the hospital for 45 cents per gallon. I continued to take milk of him until last November, but I reduced the price from time to time as milk became cheaper in the market. Mr. Wall always protested very earnestly against any reduction in the price of milk, notwithstanding he knew that I had offers to supply it cheaper than he was doing it. He would often use language like this, "You won't give a poor fellow a chance to live; it was intended in these appropriations to give us poor fellows a chance to make something"; and this he would do when he knew he was getting the highest price for his milk. Mr. Wall established a small grocery store near the hospital, and asked me to purchase the groceries from him for the hospital, saying that I ought to give the patronage to a colored man. I told him at once that inasmuch as this hospital was intended chiefly for the colored race I would most gladly give colored persons the preference if they would furnish goods as cheaply as others. I sent him several orders—large orders; but I soon found he was charging more for his goods than I could procure the same goods for at other places. I then wrote him a letter complaining of his prices, which letter was read to him when he testified here. He then put the prices down a little. But because of his importunities and his appeals as a colored man I endeavored to give him that portion of the business which he could do as cheaply as others did it. I continued to trade with him for some time all that I could consistently do, but I finally discontinued the trade altogether. When I had my last conversation with Mr. Wall, I think either just before or just after my summer vacation, I cannot tell which, he said, "You have cut the milk down so that it is not worth having. You might as well take it away from me altogether. I worked hard to get you appointed here, and now you have taken away the milk, which I was not under a compliment to you for, for Dr. Reyburn gave it to me, and I shall not stand this. You will see trouble, I think. We are going to look into the crookedness of the Freedmen's Hospital, and when we get through I will shake hands with you." This was substantially the last conversation I had with him. His plan seems to have been to go into the hospital in the morning, ask the steward what was wanted for the day, and then go and furnish it, and bring in his bill and have it paid without question, which I did not consent to do.

With regard to the testimony of Dr. Augusta, I would say that he has complained of discrimination between white and colored persons. When I went to the hospital I found two colored physicians there, Dr. Harris and Dr. Purvis. Dr. Harris was not a suitable man for the place, as he was subject to epileptic fits and has since become insane, being now in the insane asylum. I asked to have him relieved, and during the summer there were only three surgeons managing the hospital; but in the fall the patients increased, and I asked the Secretary to be permitted to appoint Dr. Augusta as an assistant surgeon. I selected him because he was colored simply. I had not much confidence in his ability as an expert surgeon, or in any particular branch, but the branch of the business in the hospital which I wanted him to do he could attend to very well. He attended to the convalescent wards and to outdoor patients; that is, the dispensary patients. It was simply a matter of color that I selected him. He knows very well that there

were white physicians, respectable physicians, making application for the place, but I selected him in preference to any one else.

As to the girl of whom he speaks being there with syphilis coming in as a dispensary patient, he says that he applied to me to admit her to the hospital. I remember nothing of the case; but I can say that it might have been true that I declined to have her come in, from the fact that oftentimes there are several girls in the hospital affected with that disease and they become troublesome, and at those times I try to keep out any increase of that class of patients.

As to her being obliged to sleep in the park, as he says, it cannot be true, because the policemen do not allow anything of that kind. They find plenty of those girls, and they take them up and carry them to the police-station, and then, if they cannot manage them there, they send them to the almshouse. There was no necessity for her to have suffered at all for want of means to be cared for. It is not true that she did suffer.

He speaks of the inspection. The rule in the hospital was for every surgeon to have his ward in good order for inspection at all times, and I myself went around occasionally, unknown to any other surgeon, to look after the wards and see if everything was right, and, as a general rule, I found a good condition of things prevailing. On Saturday we went around formally, all the physicians together, and it was the duty of each physician to speak of anything that he saw out of place, and to suggest any improvement which should be made. I do not know that Dr. Augusta suggested a single improvement while he was in the hospital. He may have done so, but I do not remember any. He speaks of the dripping of water in a certain place which he calls the companion-way. It is over the broad stair leading up to one of the upper wards. I know the place and remember the time exactly. The bath-tub is situated right over that stairway, and it got leaking and was dripping one day when I went up. I sent immediately to the engineer and had it repaired, for it needed plumbing. The thing occurred again and again, about three times. I then wrote to the engineer a note, giving him instructions to have that repaired in such a way that there would be no repetition of the trouble.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. Was it done?—A. It was done, and the trouble does not exist now.

As to the lying-in case which Dr. Augusta has alluded to, that was the case of a young colored woman who came in there, and was troubled with albuminuria. She was a patient in my ward. I have all the cases of confinement in my ward. She was taken in labor in the night, and with it convulsions. I think the convulsions came on before any labor-pains came on. There was no apparent hurry in the case, because it is always proper to wait a little for the uterus to dilate to ascertain whether labor has set in. When I went to the hospital I found her in convulsions and immediately went to work to deliver her, which is the doctrine approved by all obstetricians and all practitioners.

I dilated the uterus with my hand, introduced my hand into the vagina and into the uterus, and then I placed on the head of the child a pair of forceps. I used a new pair of forceps which Dr. Purvis had recently brought in, because they were longer than the ones which belonged to the hospital. I put the forceps on the upper strait. I remember the case very well. I brought the head down into the pelvis. The forceps sprang a little, and I was afraid I should not be able to bring it

out through the lower strait with these forceps, and I took them off, and I put on another pair which were stronger, and an excellent pair of forceps, and delivered the head. Dr. Purvis took the head, as he said, received it in a towel, and brought the child away. There is no force required after the head is delivered in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. If there was any used at this time, if this was the hundredth case, state the fact.—A. It was not the hundredth case. The shoulders were delivered as they usually are, by the expulsive pains of the mother. It was an unfortunate case. The woman was troubled with albuminuria, almost all of which cases die, and the child also died, having been poisoned somewhat, no doubt, by the condition of the blood of the mother. But the practice is in such cases always to use the forceps, never to use craniotomy. Craniotomy is to be used only in order to save the life of the mother. There are two operations: one, the Cæsaean section, which is to take the child out through the walls of the abdomen, and the other is to take the child to pieces, which are only to be resorted to in extreme cases in order to save the life of the mother. The forceps are an instrument to save both the mother and the child, and they do it in a great many cases.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. In that case would it have been good practice to have delivered the mother otherwise than with forceps?—A. It would have been in violation of all rules of practice, and all rules of common sense. I have had a great deal of practice in obstetrics. I had 1,200 cases before the war, in my native town, all of which I have a record of, and I know from my own experience, and from long reading on that subject, that it is a common-sense matter, which gentlemen not conversant with the profession can readily understand.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. How many physicians were present at this operation?—A. I sent immediately for Dr. Purvis and Dr. Glennan. Dr. Augusta came in of his own accord. I did not consult him on such occasions.

Q. Were you all agreed as to the mode of treatment?—A. All agreed as to the mode of treatment. There is no question of it. We proceeded just as though we all knew what to do.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Did Augusta give any advice, as he suggested here?—A. I do not remember to have heard it.

Q. Did you hear any?—A. I cannot say that I heard it.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What is the "slush fund" of the institution? Just explain that and in reference to the sales of manure?—A. We keep two horses, and have kept four at times since I have been there. The manure which they make is sold to some of the countrymen and the money that comes from it is put into the hands of Dr. Glennan, and he keeps it, and that constitutes the "slush fund." There may be some other little matters which yield money that I do not think of which go into that, but they are very trifling. Dr. Glennan expends that by paying the postage on letters, buying postage-stamps and car-tickets for the messengers, and often-

times needles and thread, and small matters of that kind he expends that money for. I never receive any of it; I have nothing to do with it.

Q. It is a small amount, and all used for the benefit of the institution in these little matters?—A. Yes, sir. He keeps it in an envelope, and if I want any little thing I ask him if he has anything in the "slush fund," anything that is not proper to make a voucher for. We do not want to make a voucher to send to the Interior Department for small, little things that are being constantly needed. I ask him if there is anything in the "slush fund" to pay for it. He goes to the envelope, and if he finds a dollar or half-dollar there, he tells me "yes," and pays for it.

Q. That is, you do not want to send a voucher to the Interior Department for a paper of pins, or a half dollar's worth of tickets, or a few needles?—A. No, sir.

Q. Does Dr. Glennan keep an account of these small items, to your knowledge?—A. He does.

Q. Of debits and credits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has any report with reference to this matter been made, at your request, by Dr. Glennan?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Here is a paper dated October 19, 1877, and signed Dr. Glennan. Is that the report? [Handing a paper to the witness.]—A. [Examining.] That is the report.

The document is as follows :

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL.

October 19, 1877.

SIR: In reply to inquiry in regard to the sale of barrels, manure, rags, &c., I have the honor to state that all funds obtained from the sale of such articles have been received and kept by me in what is known as the Slush Fund. I have had control of this fund during the administrations of Dr. Reyburn and yourself.

During your administration we have sold rags on one occasion only, from which sale the sum of three dollars and some cents was received. From barrels we have received some months sixty to ninety cents, and some months nothing. Swill, \$2.50 per month for some time past, before that hardly anything. Manure, \$1 or \$1.50 per month.

I do not think it would average \$2 per month. Sometimes for months none would be sold. This manure has been sold by the drivers, and the money received for it has been brought to me by them. My estimate is in reference to the money received. One-half or more of all the money received has been regularly expended for post-office stamps for use of hospital and patients and for newspapers. The remainder of this fund has been expended in paying car-fare for patients and messengers, in purchasing cotton for dispensary, buttons, needles, thread, paying freight-bills, medicines, instruments, tacks, twine, screws, nails, printing labels, oil-cloth, indelible ink for marking hospital clothing, toll to Arlington in case of funerals, paid carpenters for small jobs, paid men for putting in coal, for repairing clocks, putting bottoms in chairs, and little extra articles for patients.

There has never been a time when the balance on hand exceeded \$10, and frequently there would be nothing, and there is nothing on hand at present.

The sale of the articles has been left entirely to employés. I have made no sale myself, and have not received any money directly from the parties purchasing except in one instance, that of \$8 from Mr. W. B. Weller for the accumulation of manure of six or eight months or longer.

Very respectfully,

P. GLENNAN, M. D.

DR. G. S. PALMER,
Surgeon-in-Chief Freedmen's Hospital.

Q. Are the statements contained in this report correct to your own knowledge, as to the general course of dealing in that matter?—A. They are.

Q. Have you a permit from the board of health for the removal of the *débris* of the dissecting-room of the medical college of Howard University?—A. I have.

Q. Please produce it to the committee?—A. [Handing a paper.] This is a copy of it. It is as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
BOARD OF HEALTH, OFFICE OF REGISTRAR,
Washington, February 2, 1878.

Permission is hereby given Dr. G. S. Palmer to remove the *débris* of the dissecting-room of the medical college of Howard University to the potter's field for burial, due care being taken to have the material properly inclosed and deodorized to prevent nuisance injurious to health.

D. W. BLISS, M. D.,
Registrar, U. S. S.

Q. What do you do with the *débris* of the dissecting-room?—A. Box it up and send it to the potter's-field, and it is buried there.

Q. In all cases?—A. In all cases.

Q. It has been stated by Mr. Felton that you are accustomed to curse and swear?—A. It is news to me that I ever indulged in such habits at all.

Q. You have never sworn about the hospital in his presence or out of his presence?—A. No, sir; it is not my habit at all.

Q. Is it the habit of Dr. Purvis?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is an entire fabrication?—A. It is entirely a fabrication. I will state here that Dr. Purvis, in all his intercourse with me and in the hospital, has been very gentlemanly; he has never used any bad language to my knowledge, but has always manifested an interest in the hospital and in the patients of the hospital, and has conducted himself with a great deal of professional ability.

Q. And in no instance, during all the time you and Dr. Purvis have been there, have you indulged in bad language to the patients or otherwise?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Is there any person in charge of the hospital grounds and buildings at night after you leave there?—A. There is a watchman, whose orders are to make hourly patrols all over the grounds.

Q. He is there constantly?—A. He is there constantly.

Q. And is presumed to be up during the night?—A. I think he is up. I take means of ascertaining that.

Q. Who is the watchman now?—A. His name is Stevens.

Q. How long has he been there?—A. About three months, I should say.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. I wish to ask you in reference to a burglary that Mr. Felton testified to as having occurred there, in which he alleged that he lost valuable clothing, and that others lost clothing to the value of several hundred dollars. If that burglary occurred, and you know the circumstances under which it took place, and if there is any reasonable suspicion as to the person who did it, state it.—A. Dr. Purvis informed me that a burglary had occurred; that some clothing had been taken out of the baggage-room on the 25th of February; but I do not know how it occurred. The case was reported to the detectives, and they were there and examined into it, and I do not know what conclusion they have come to. I know they said to me when they were going through the wards and examining the place that it must have been done by two persons, one inside of the ward who took the things out of the baggage-room and threw them out, and another outside receiving them. That was their opinion then. They so stated to me. Further than that I do not know.

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Have you any idea of the value of the property Felton lost?—A. I have not, but I think it could be but very small. Dr. Purvis could tell you about that, inasmuch as it was in his ward, and he notes the apparel the patients have.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. The idea of his statement seemed to be that it was in default of a night-watch at the hospital this thing occurred. Was there a night-watch?—A. There was a night-watch; and it so happened that on that night the fence on the Seventh-street side had been removed by the proprietors of the land; a piece of land had been sold off, and the party owning it had taken down the fence for the purpose of building. It so happened, further, that on that night I had placed an extra watch in the ward where the circumstance happened. I put him on watch there in consequence of the complaint which Brown, the former night-watch, made of the abuse which Mr. Felton dealt out toward him, and he said he could not stand it and he wanted to be relieved from duty there. I got an old nurse that I was acquainted with to go there and take the place of night-watch in the ward, and he came on that night at six o'clock. The parties in the ward did not know he was coming until he presented himself there, and Brown took the ward down below.

Q. Was Sanders on duty that night?—A. No, sir; Sanders is a day-nurse and goes off at six o'clock.

Q. Does he go out of the hospital?—A. He goes out of the hospital grounds.

Q. Was he out that night?—A. Yes, sir; he is never in there at night.

Q. It was insisted by Mr. Felton (and he said that was the opinion of the detectives) that it was done by some one inside the building, and he reasoned that it must have been Sanders, because he was inside the building.—A. He was not inside the building that night.

Q. And you did not have a night-watch on that night?—A. Yes, sir; and he had special orders to patrol out in that direction.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Where the fence was down?—A. Where the fence was down, to keep watch of what was going on there.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What is your theory of that robbery?—A. My theory is that some person acting under the direction of Felton and Johnson in that ward, got up in the night, carried the clothes into the coat-room, and threw the clothes out the window, and that a certain party, who had been a patient there and was also in collusion with them, came and got them by a previous arrangement. That is my theory.

Q. What was the object of that?—A. The object was to bring notoriety of an unfavorable character upon the hospital.

Q. Why did that happen on that particular night? Do you think that the persons who did it knew that the extra watchman was coming on that night?—A. No, sir; I think it was accidental, altogether.

Q. You think the burglary would not have happened if the parties who committed it had known that an extra watchman was on that night?—A. I think it would have made a difference with them.

Q. Then on account of Sanders's absence the affair reflects no discredit on him?—A. Not at all, if it was done in that way. Sanders was not in the case at all, unless he was the outside man.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Have you any reason to suspect that he was ?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. What is Sanders's character ?—A. As near as I can learn—I have inquired about it—Felton has complained of his stealing things in the ward before, and I investigated his character as well as I could. I found he was a member of the church, and people had confidence in him as to his honesty.

Q. Did you investigate the particular instance of stealing that Felton complained of ?—A. I could get no proof of that at all.

Q. That anything was lost ?—A. That anything was lost.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. Did you get any of this clothing back again ?—A. No, sir.

Q. It has never been heard from ?—A. Never.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. Was Felton pretty well off in clothing when he came there ?—A. I admitted Felton myself, and I do not remember that he brought a scrap with him. He was carried down, as he said, from the main building to his ward in a chair by my direction, and I do not remember to have seen a single item of clothing with him.

Q. Do you know whether any was sent afterward to him ?—A. I do not know of any, though he has received some since he came there. The value of his clothing must be very small, for his shirts must be rotten or stained to such an extent that they are of no market value at all.

THURSDAY, *March 21, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the Freedmen's Hospital.

JOHN J. CALVERT recalled.

By Mr. EATON :

Question. We understand from a note which you addressed us that you claim the privilege of appearing before us again in reference to some attacks which you think have been made upon you ?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Of course we do not want to reopen the case, nor do you. You have testified to what you know in regard to these matters. Now, state anything that you wish to state in relation to defending your character against any charges which you suppose may have been made.—A. I will, sir.

Q. Be as full as is necessary, but as brief as you can and do yourself justice.—A. I cannot say what these parties have said against me ; but from what I understand from the newspaper reports, Mr. Roby has given you a conversation with him in regard to matters around here. It is a well known fact in this hospital that I have never held any conversation with Mr. Roby ; that we are antagonistic to each other. I have nothing to do with him, nothing to say to him at all. That is a well-known fact around here, that I have never held any conversation with him at all. The conversation that he imputes to me is a malicious fabrication, gotten up to injure me.

By Mr. ALLISON :

Q. You have had no conversation with him ?—A. No conversation

whatever. As to Mr. Banks, we are antagonistic, and have been, I suppose, ever since we have been upon the ground. That is a well-known fact, that I have shunned him when he comes to me and undertaken to hold conversations with me; that I have told him that I did not want anything to do with him. I drove him from me like a dog. That is a well known fact around this place. We hold no conversation at all together. I say, "no conversation." At the time this first body was found, or resurrected, he came to me on the sidewalk and accused me of directing Lieutenant Johnson to where these bodies were buried, and he told me, "You know very well that what I do around here is done by orders." I told him I wanted to hold no conversation with him at all, and did not care anything about it. He has come into my engine-room and wanted to hold conversations. I have come outside and taken him and drove him away from me.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. In other words, you have held no conversation with him?—A. None whatever. It is a well known fact that we are bitter enemies, if I must say that I do not want any conversation with him. He is beneath my notice. I consider him so.

Q. That disposes of these two men?—A. Yes, sir. I really do not know this other man. In regard to some plumbing work, or something, I merely got a glimpse at that. I do not know what he said.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Who was that?—A. I cannot tell you; a white man that has been kept around here. I do not know anything about him. That is about the amount of it. He is a man I have nothing to do with and never have had. As to Mr. Sheehy, I was never in his place once in ten years. Mr. Sheehy keeps a rum-shop over here. I do not visit it and have not had any conversation or anything to do with that man since I have been in this place. I knew him when he was on Fourteenth street. There is a kind of bad feeling between us in regard to a debt for five dollars which he claims that I owed him and I claimed that I did not, and there was no friendship between us at all on account of that. I have never been in his place, I think, twice in ten years.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. Did you have any conversation with him such as he relates?—A. None whatever.

Q. None at all?—A. None at all.

Q. And that is, as you describe the other to be, false?—A. False; maliciously false.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. You do not know that it is malicious?—A. Men who come up and swear such a thing as that must be malicious, when it is a well-known fact around here—almost every man in the place knows I do not hold any conversation with them even in business affairs.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. That disposes of Mr. Sheehy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any other person who has said anything against you that you wish to notice?—A. None that I have had any notice of. I do not know of any other parties. I know nothing of what has been said but from newspaper reports. This I was more astonished at, that they would go and take parties who were malicious towards me, who really, I believe, some of them, would cut my throat in a minute; this man

Banks, particularly. I have no confidence in the man. Right out in public, and men around here have known that I have driven him away from me when he has tried to get into conversation with me. I would have nothing to do with him, did not want to have anything to do with him, and do not now.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON (colored) recalled :

By Mr. EATON:

Question. We understand that you desire to say something by way of defending yourself against certain charges which it is said have been made, and it is very proper that you should have an opportunity to state fully with regard to those matters. You know what they are, because they have been printed?—Answer. I have seen them published.

Q. Charges that you were arrested for receiving property that was stolen, knowing it to be such?—A. I have seen that charge.

Q. I am speaking of the charge as made. You saw also that it has been alleged that you kept a house of ill-fame?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I believe those are the only charges which have been made against you.—A. I think there are some more.

Q. Very well, go on and state in your own way what you wish to say in regard to the charges which have been made?—A. I have made a memorandum of them. I saw a statement of officer West that he arrested me. He never arrested me in his life. He never said he wanted to arrest me. In 1865 I think it was—I disremember the exact time—I used to visit a place in the first ward, I think, near Fourteenth street. A woman lived in this house that I visited. She was a single woman. Some parties, I think, took a prejudice against her and said she kept a house of ill-fame, because single men visited there. The officers made a raid on the house. Lieutenant Eckloff was the officer who raided the house. When he came there I was there that night. He took a woman that lived next door. The woman that lived in the house had gone out to the pump or some place, and a young woman living next door came in there, and they arrested her. I do not know whether they took her to the station-house or not. I went away leaving her there under arrest. The next morning I heard they did put some of them in the station-house that night. I do not know whether she was put there or not. The woman brought witnesses next morning. I was going down town the next morning, down Four-and-a-half street, on some business, and I met the bailiff of the court. He said to me, "Bob, I heard some talk down at the police court, something about you and a bawdy-house case." I said "What?" He said, "Yes, they are connecting your name with it, and some of them charge that you were the renter of that house and the keeper of that house." I said, "That is not so." He asked me, "Do you visit there?" I said, "Yes, frequently." I was near the City-hall at the time, and the police court was on C street, a square below. I went down and went into the court and saw Lieutenant Eckloff there. I went into the district attorney's office, and told them that I had been informed there had been some charges made against me, and I wanted to know if it was so. I did not want to be arrested, and so I got a friend of mine, and he went down with me in case there should be need for any one to go on my bond. I saw the district attorney and he did not say much, but told me to talk to Lieutenant Eckloff. I spoke with the lieutenant a little while. He said, "Johnson, I want you to tell me about this house; you go there." Said I, "Lieutenant, I cannot tell

you anything wrong about the house, for I know nothing wrong, and nothing about anybody that goes there; I know not a thing in the world that would in any way commit the parties who live there or parties who go there." Said he, "You know all about it, Bob." He knew me pretty well. I said, "No, sir; I give my word of honor that I know nothing wrong that has ever occurred in that house; I know nothing about any transactions of any persons except myself; I have been there often and often, and I have seen officer West on that beat," the very officer who gave testimony against me. "I have seen him there frequently, and of course if there was anything of that kind, as he is on that beat, he should not visit the house." The lieutenant said, "You know all about it, and must tell me; if you don't tell me I must arrest you as keeper of the house; you are very intimate with the woman, I know." I said to him, "Lieutenant, of course if you put me under arrest for that, I am willing that you should." Said he, "All right, I'll have to do it." Then said I, "I have bail ready here, if necessary." Then he said, "I was told you rented that house." The property belonged to Mr. Fitzhugh Fox, and I said to him, "If you think that I am the renter of that house, I should like you to go right to Mr. Fox, because I am in business, and I do not have much time to myself." "Well," said he, "we will not dispose of you to-day; we want you to appear here on Saturday." That was on Thursday, I think. On Saturday I went to court accordingly, and I believe I went before the court, though I disremember whether the case came up in open court or whether it was settled in the office, but I think I went into court; any way I summoned Mr. Fitzhugh Fox. He told that he did not know me in any business transactions whatever, did not rent me the house, did not hold me responsible for the house, knew me in no way, shape, or form. Of course the court dismissed me on that charge immediately. The woman was afterwards tried in that same court, and think she took an appeal to the criminal court, and her case was brought up in the criminal court, and Judge McArthur dismissed her. The charge was not sustained, and nothing wrong was found against the woman. The neighbors—married people, married men and their wives, who lived next door to her, people who lived all in the neighborhood who knew her—were summoned by her into court, and they all testified that they knew nothing wrong about her; that they knew her to be a hard-working woman and saw nothing wrong about her. The officers could say nothing wrong against her. They knew that when they went there they found a woman who lived next door in the house and another girl and two young men, and that was all they could say; that was all the charge, and the case was dismissed by Judge McArthur.

Of course, under those circumstances I never was arrested by the officer. In the first place he perjured himself by saying he arrested me. He never did in his life, and his own lieutenant, I think, ought to be a witness in regard to that. He knows that they never arrested me. If there was any arrest he made it himself. I do not know whether you call it an arrest, but I went into the court-room where they had these parties that were arrested, and in the district attorney's office had the conversation I have mentioned to you with the lieutenant and the district attorney at that time. I forget now who was the district attorney, there have been so many district attorneys in that court. I did not consider myself under arrest then.

Now, in regard to Lieutenant Vernon's statement, and that of the man Marshall, who was before the committee in regard to my character. I testified before this committee that I used to keep a restaurant, and had

twenty or thirty regular boarders and forty or fifty transient boarders every day to take their meals. To break down my character for veracity, they bring this man Marshall in to testify that I never had such a trade. I kept a restaurant on E street, near the National Theatre, three doors from the theatre, and I used to feed all the hack-drivers from Willard's Hotel, and the Imperial Hotel, and all the men around about there; and a great many porters and men in the different business places along the Avenue down to between Ninth and Tenth streets used to take their meals at my house. This man Marshall, when I first went in business there, went in with me, and I found all the time he was with me my business went crooked. He was a man who did not have much education, and he could not cover up what he did very well. I found that he was robbing me; I was satisfied he was robbing me. He goes off and buys, I think, 950 cigars, not 10,000 as this gentleman said, but 950, and sends them to the house by the man he bought them from; at least the man came there and represented that, and I can produce to-day a man who was there when he brought them and saw me refuse to take them because I did not want to touch them. That same man went before the court and showed that was the case, and I was dismissed. The officer says the case never came up in court, but it did and I was exonerated. This man Marshall sends 950 cigars to the house by a man who brought a note for me to take the cigars and pay him for them. Marshall was my partner at the time. The man who brought them had another man with him. I read the note and said "I tell you Marshall is a very peculiar man, and if I take these cigars and pay for them he may not be satisfied with what I pay you for them, and I would rather you would wait and give them to him himself." I was not told they were stolen or anything of that kind at the time. I did not want to pay for them for fear of a dispute with my partner about the price of them. The man who brought them said, "It is all right, Mr. Johnson; he told me to bring them to the house, he could not get here himself; you take them." I was in the dining-room talking with a man at the time. I said to him, "Jim, Dick is a very curious man, and, while I would take those cigars under other circumstances, he and I are not on very good terms, and I do not know what to do." My friend said, "Oh, I would take the cigars; the man who brought them has brought you a note from Dick." I took them, and paid the man for them. Marshall did not come to the house that day or that night. The next morning when he came I said to him, "Dick, a man brought some cigars for you, and left them with me, and I paid him for them." I forget now what it was that I paid for them exactly, but I think twelve or thirteen dollars, or something in that neighborhood. He paid me the money back again. I had a large sideboard in the house, where I put them, and I pointed to it and said to him, "There are the cigars." I would not put them in the bar-room. I did not attend bar regularly; I had a bar-keeper; so I thought I would put them in the bottom of the sideboard. I showed them to him, and he paid me for them. That day I went out, and was out all day until about 7 o'clock in the evening. At 7 in the evening, when I came in, Dick came to me and said, "Bob, there seems to be some trouble about those cigars." "What is it," said I. "Well," said he "Lieutenant Skippon and Sergeant Vernon"—(he was not a lieutenant then)—"and officer Moore and some other officer came here and asked me if I bought some cigars, and it seems as if those cigars I bought were stolen." I said, "Did you give them to the officers?" He said, "No." Well, I did not consider that I had had anything to do

with them, because I merely received them for him, and gave the money for them and got it back again, and I considered that that was proper. I did not know at first whether he proposed to charge me for half of them and have them used in the house or not. I paid the full price, and he paid it back to me. I told him I had not bought them, and said, "Why did you not give them to the officers? You ought to have done that." "Well," said he, "I did not know exactly what to tell them. I was confused at the time." Said I, "You never ought to have done that, Dick; you are likely to get yourself into difficulty." "Well," said he, "I will see them to-morrow morning." That was in the evening. We kept open there pretty late for theater business, and I used to be on duty at night.

Shortly after that, in came Lieutenant Skippon and these officers again. The lieutenant walked in and said, "How do you do, Bob?" I answered, "How do you do, lieutenant?" Said he, "I was told that you bought some cigars." "No," said I, "I have not bought any." Dick was right there, and I wanted him to tell that he had bought the cigars; but I did not say so. I said "I did not buy any cigars." I only bought cigars from a man on E street near 8th. I think his name was Cairo. I never bought a cigar since I have been in business only from that man. I used generally to go down there and buy 700 or 800 or a thousand at a time. "Well," said the lieutenant, "I asked Dick about it, and he said he had not bought any." Said I, "Did Dick tell you he had not bought any?" "Yes," said he, "he did." Dick saw I was doubtful about it, and felt very bad, and was just about to expose him. The officer said "Show me your room; I should like to look in your room." Said I, "Certainly;" and I gave him the key of my wardrobe, which was the only thing I had locked. He went and looked, and said, "You have not bought any cigars?" Said I, "I did not buy any cigars. If there are any cigars in the house, Marshall has bought them." Said he, "I have seen Dick, and he told me he did not buy any." The lieutenant said no more, but walked out. By the time he got to the door Marshall had slipped out back into what is called Theater alley, where the actors go through, and he came down the alley to E street and met Lieutenant Skippon and said to him, "Lieutenant, Johnson bought some cigars—

Q. You did not hear that?—A. No, I did not; but officer Moore—you can summon him—is the very man who told me. When I went to court, all the policemen and all the detectives said they were astonished to see me being in any such connection as that. I was never arrested in my life for anything like that before. They said they knew Dick to be a regular partner of thieves and keep thieves' property in the house, and officer Moore said to me, "Bob, it looked very peculiar, and the old man"—by that he meant the lieutenant—"thought so too; but I cannot dictate to him; he went out the private way and told us you bought those cigars." Then, said I, "He is trying to get me into difficulty; I did not say anything about the cigars, because I left it to him to tell himself." I knew I could prove by the man who was there at the time that I did not buy them. So the next day a police-officer came there, and did not even bring a warrant or arrest me. He knew me very well. I was in business there, and I suppose he thought I would not run away. Says he, "We want you to come down to the station-house this morning and go to court." He asked me where the cigars were. I told him, and he went and took them, and carried them to the station-house.

Q. Where were they?—A. In the house. Marshall had never moved

them from where I put them. They were in the side-board. There were seven boxes, I think. The officer took them to the station-house himself, and said "We want you to come over to the station-house." Said I, "Do you want Marshall to go?" Said he, "No." Said I, "All right; I'll go." I sent for a good friend of mine to go on my bond, and I went over into the court myself. The case was brought up in the court then and postponed until Saturday. On Saturday I gave a thousand-dollar bond to appear on Monday, for it was postponed again until Monday. I appeared on Monday in that court, and they sent all hands to the grand jury; that was in the police court.

Q. What do you mean by "all hands?"—A. They asked me who I got the cigars from, and I told them. By "all hands" I mean myself and the men who brought the cigars there. I told the police who they were, so that they might find them all out. They found the thieves. They told them that Mr. Marshall bought those cigars from them; stated in the presence of the officers that I did not buy the cigars, but said Marshall was the man who bought those cigars; and the man added, "Marshall has bought cigars from me before, and I think it is a shame to put the crime on that man," pointing to me. The thieves said that themselves; told the officers so. I think Mr. Sargent was one of them, and Mr. McDevitt was the other. He said "Bob Johnson never bought cigars from me in his life." He told them that in the court, and the court then asked me why I took them, and I said, "Gentlemen, I took those cigars. I knew nothing about what Mr. Marshall did, or any of his transactions; of course this thing falls on me. I took those cigars for him; are you not satisfied?" "Yes," they said right up and down, plainly. There was no trial scarcely at all. The court exonerated me of the charge of buying stolen goods. I produced a man to show that I told these parties I did not wish to receive those cigars because I thought it was more than likely Marshall would have a dispute about the payment for them. The court exonerated me and sent me home. That ends the cigar matter and Lieutenant Vernon. Then this man Crusor testified that I was a convict in the Washington jail. I never was convicted of any crime since I was born in the world; was never fined; never sentenced to jail; never proved to have violated a corporation ordinance in my life. I am telling you that under oath.

By Mr. ALLISON:

Q. Is there anything else you wish to say?—A. Yes, sir; there is a little more I want to say. But in regard to this man Carson I want to tell you what is the matter with him. When we had the right of franchise in this District he was a kind of political worker, and he had a right good influence among the colored people in the District. I used to go around among them myself. This man Carson wanted me on one or two occasions to come up and help him, and support his party; I was a little opposed to it and objected. In that way I incurred his hostility. On one or two occasions, I believe, I opposed him in some meetings for nominations, or something of that kind. He got hostile to me. He came before the committee. I do not know what his testimony before you was, but I believe he testified that I had promised in political meetings to assist him and then went against him, or did not do it, or something of that kind. He was asked what was bad about my veracity. This was before the department committee. To rebut this man I summoned several witnesses here before that committee—Mr. Ewing, Mr. Ward, and other gentlemen—who certified to my character; gentlemen who have

known me from boyhood, known me all my lifetime, some of them, and they certified that they never knew anything detrimental to my character, and that they would believe me on oath or off oath—gentlemen holding positions here under the government of the District, and other men, citizens of the best standing. If you inquire into those men, you will find that there is no man like Perry Carson. He has an indictment hanging over him to-day; it has not been dismissed, and it has been so for five or six months past. He had to leave Baltimore City for criminal offenses. Dick Marshall is a man who has been arrested on several occasions for having stolen goods in his possession, keeping a gambling-house, beating a woman (a prostitute), and such things as that. Jim Leonard has been arrested for keeping policy-shops, and been arrested for keeping a gambling-house, I am pretty sure. Those are the men who come up to villify my character. If you can find any such witnesses that I have produced to testify to my character I have no more to say. I called on gentlemen, men of good standing, and I can give you their names, and you can see who they are.

Mr. Crusor came to me here in this hospital, came into my ward one morning with Dr. Purvis. While Dr. Purvis was looking at his patients Crusor came to me. I had walked out into the water-closet to clean my teeth. It was in the morning. When I went out in the hall, Mr. Crusor came and stopped and looked out of the window into the yard. When I came out of the bath-room from cleaning my teeth he walked up to me and said, "Johnson, what is all this trouble here at the hospital?" I explained to him. Crusor had known me a long time. I know him, and if I was disposed I could produce witnesses that could say something detrimental to him, right from Georgetown, where he has lived all his life, but I would not go to that trouble. Mr. Crusor came to me and made some remarks which I marked down at the time; I paid particular attention to them, for he threatened me afterward. He persuaded me, all he knew how, to withdraw my charges and to stop the prosecution against the medical staff of the hospital. He asked me as a friend of his, as an old acquaintance and friend of my father's, and all the like of that. Of course, I told him I had made charges and I could not go back on my word. I told him I was treated bad and felt a little bad over it, and if I had it to go over again, probably, I would not do it, but, said I, "I have given my word and I will not make myself out a liar; I am satisfied I am right." Mr. Crusor said to me on that occasion—

Q. Did you mark it down at the time on the paper you now have before you?—A. Not on this paper, on another. I took notes of nearly everything that occurred. I made little memoranda here and there in lead-pencil marks, which I rubbed out when I put them down with pen and ink afterward, as I got an opportunity.

Mr. Crusor asked me at the time to stop proceedings against the men here. He went with me into a long conversation. He told me that it would be the means of breaking up the hospital, and was talking in that tone. I told him I could not help what was done; that the hospital might as well be broken up as carried on the way it was. Said I, "The patients do not receive much benefit, and the government appropriation is being embezzled and squandered, &c., and I don't think it is right, Mr. Crusor; my conscience tells me that I would be doing wrong to undertake to stop any proceedings now after they have gone as far as they have." He insisted on it; I stood firm in my decision. Finally he said that I would lose his friendship by proceeding in my course, and that my friends outside did not like my proceedings in this matter, &c.

I told him I could not help who liked it or did not like it ; and, another thing, if I lost his friendship by these proceedings I would accept his hostility and abide the consequences, or something to that effect, I remarked to him at the time. He talked on and talked on for some length of time, and finally Dr. Purvis got through with his patients while we were standing in the hall, and he came out, and Crusor went down-stairs with the doctor and went out into the yard, and they stood out there and talked some time. I was at the window looking at them. He as good as told me if I proceeded in this matter in the investigation, or preferring charges, he would do something—I did not know what. In fact, I did not care much, because I knew he could not do much to me. So, finally, when he came before the department committee he would not swear point-blank that I had ever been a convict in the Washington jail. The gentlemen of the committee—and there were three counsel here, Mr. Riddle, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Cook—and they all asked him, and tried to bring the word right out of him, and I tried to bring it out of him, if he had ever known me to serve a sentence in this jail, and he said he was under the impression, but he would not say positively that he ever knew it to be a fact to his own knowledge, but he said it was his impression. They asked him if he knew it to be a fact, and he said he was under the impression. That was the only way he would answer. I said to him then, “I should like you to tell the gentlemen if you know that to be the fact.”

By Mr. EATON :

Q. Is there anything else you wish to state?—A. There are a few statements I should like to make in regard to hospital matters.

Q. No. We only came here to give you a full opportunity to vindicate yourself. We have gone into hospital matters heretofore. You have had a full opportunity heretofore of disclosing your knowledge on those subjects, and we cannot reopen matters that have been closed.—A. I believe I have disposed of all the charges against me. I desire it to be noted on the record that I have further information which I desire to give in regard to hospital matters and other witnesses.

Q. We have spent weeks in the investigation, and have heard all sides. We do not propose to go over the same ground again.

SATURDAY, *March 23, 1878.*

The subcommittee met at the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

O. S. B. WALL (colored) recalled.

By Mr. SARGENT :

Q. We have received your request to appear before the committee to answer as to some personal matters affecting yourself testified to by other witnesses. We are ready to hear your statement in reference to those matters.—A. I have not said anything since my former testimony, but there has been some further testimony since that time.

Q. Go on and make any statement you wish about it.—A. With reference to which ; the ones that I had replied to, or something that has been said since ?

By Mr. EATON :

Q. You do not want to speak of what you have replied to. We have

that; but, as we understood, you have asked us to hear you about certain matters that have transpired since you were examined.—A. I have not said a word, nor intimated to anybody that I would. I said with reference to that it made no difference; but I am glad of the opportunity.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. We understood that was your wish, and therefore we subpoenaed you.—A. I am thankful to you, Senators, but I had never intimated to anybody that I would, because I did not feel satisfied with the examination I had before, and I should not have appeared before the committee from that fact.

If I remember rightly, now, Mr. Cruser made another statement with reference to myself, and so did Mr. Charles Peters. I did not fix my mind in good condition, because I did not know just exactly the matter I was to come for to-day. I have been wondering what it was. With reference to Mr. Cruser, I would not change my statement about him at all. He came to me just as I stated before, and almost upon his knees, and implored me to let up, and all that sort of thing, I telling him it was not me, and that I had not mentioned the matter at all, only I was in sympathy with it. As to Mr. Peters, I do not remember when I ever had conversation with him, and I would not state positively. I do not remember now just what he stated about the matter between him and me. I do not remember except in a sort of general way that I had a talk with him some time before, but do not remember what I said. I know that he entirely agreed with me and felt that people had been treated wrongfully there and there ought to be a change. I remember that very well, but I do not remember all the words that I said. I do not remember what he said and I said, and I cannot make an interesting replication to that, so far as that is concerned.

I want to call your attention to a certain matter that it seems Dr. Purvis has stated about my having commenced this investigation of the Freedmen's Hospital after I was cut off from furnishing supplies. Mr. Douglass called my attention to that fact yesterday, and I stated to him what I have here, and I obtained it by writing a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, and got it this morning. I think the investigation commenced about the 1st of August. The whole matter must have been worked up and got into charges and specifications during a week or two previous. Here is a letter that I want to show in reference to that. Just in this way these gentlemen have treated me right along, making their charges and statements.

[Submitting the following letter:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
March 23, 1878.

SIR: In reply to your note of this date, asking for the date of your last voucher or receipt for furnishing supplies for the Freedmen's Hospital, I would respectfully state that the books of this department show that the last voucher paid you was on the 5th December, 1877, when the sum of fifty-eight and $\frac{4}{100}$ dollars (\$58 $\frac{4}{100}$) was paid you for milk furnished.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. M. LOCKWOOD,
Chief Clerk.

O. S. B. WALL, Esq., *Present*.

I just wanted to say that I suppose about the last of July, perhaps, this matter commenced, up to which time I knew nothing about the commencement of it, only saw it when it was presented to me by this man Johnson presenting it. Then I did not know him and asked some-

body who he was. I went right along from July, in August, September, October, and November, and up to December, pending the whole investigation, after the papers were submitted to the Secretary of the Interior and pending his conclusions, up to the 5th of December, furnished hundreds of dollars' worth after I had met Dr. Palmer, and as I thought honestly and like a man told him that I thought he was a good man and how the matters were running there, but I thought it needed investigation; the thing had become crooked and corrupt. That was just my opinion, and of course I told him, "Doctor, I don't want to be two-faced; I am going to sympathize with this investigation, and hope it may be thorough, and if you are right you will be vindicated, and if you are not let there be a change there." I said just that to him right after the charges and specifications had been published, and I did not know anything about them a minute before they were published, not a particle about their coming.

Q. Did Johnson submit them to you before or after they were published?—A. Before. He came into my office with Mr. McFarland, and McFarland handed them to me. I asked what the paper was; looked over it, read it almost all, not all of it, saw it was in reference to the Freedmen's Hospital. Then next morning, I think it was, these charges were published, and then I read them thoroughly.

Q. Had they been filed in the Interior Department at the time you read them?—A. I do not know. I never asked and do not really know, but I suppose they had been; it is only a supposition.

Q. I understood you to testify before that you knew nothing about them until you read them in the papers?—A. I did not thoroughly. That was the truth. He had this manuscript written miserably scrawly. I did not know whose hand it was in. I glanced over it, and knew about the substance of it, but I never knew thoroughly about the details until I read them in the papers, where I could read them, but I knew the day before it was talked of and agitated, for he was there and I asked McFarland who this man Johnson was; if he was a man of any standing, said I, "He seems to be intelligent." I spoke about that way. I did not know them thoroughly until I saw them in the newspapers.

By Mr. EATON:

Q. You did not know Robert Johnson?—A. No, sir; had no sort of idea of him until that matter came up and McFarland came to my office.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. How happened McFarland to come with him to your office to show you these charges, if you took no interest in the matter and had had no previous consultation?—A. I had attended to a good deal of law business for McFarland, and latterly, for the last two or three years, he has been about my office almost all the time. I do not think I had ever even talked to McFarland about the hospital; I know I never had about any investigation. I had spoken to McFarland a number of times about the complaints of those old people as I would pass by the place many times, and I had to other people, and that I hoped it would be righted, and hoped they would mend their ways there, or something of that kind. I used to make those usual remarks. I had spoken to him a number of times in that way. When he saw this he might, from his knowledge that I was dissatisfied with the running of the hospital, have brought him in; but it was a fact, just as I told you, that he never had talked to me about the investigation or I with him. I had simply refrained from doing it, not because I felt that it ought not to be done,

but because we had been so persecuted in this District, year after year, with investigations that I was sick, and I thought everybody was nauseated with so much investigation.

I told several of my white friends that if it was not for that state of things I should like to see the Freedmen's Hospital investigated, and the Freedman's Bank and some other institutions that I knew the colored people were suffering a great deal from.

Q. They did not cut you off from furnishing milk on account of your proceedings in regard to the hospital?—A. No, sir; that is as true as you live, sir. They did not say a word to me about it, and I went right on furnishing everything for five or six months, as this paper shows.

Q. Anything besides milk?—A. I was connected with a German fellow who did the most of the other furnishing. That I never did much about.

Q. When was your last voucher of Fink & Co.?—A. I do not remember. I intended in my letter (which I was sorry I omitted) to ask the department to give me the amount for each month, and the nature of the things I furnished. I started this boy Fink there, but I did not stop in the store probably once in two weeks.

Q. Then you wish to exonerate Dr. Palmer from any malice in cutting you off from the trade on account of your course toward the hospital?—A. I have never intimated anything of that kind. I think Dr. Palmer is a nice man. I am perfectly willing to say that. I think, though, he has been badly used by persons connected with him. I think Dr. Palmer is an honest, quiet, nice gentleman.

Q. Is there any other matter about yourself that you wish to testify to?—A. No.



APPENDIX.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1878.

SIR: In compliance with the request of the subcommittee investigating the affairs of the Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia, per Mr. Thomas P. Cleaves, clerk, dated the 4th instant, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of the report made by Messrs. Reynolds, Holden, and Clements, a committee appointed by me in August last to investigate and report in relation to the financial operations of that institution.

Very respectfully,

C. SCHURZ,
Secretary.

HON. AARON A. SARGENT,
Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August, 1877.*

SIR: The committee appointed 28th July, 1877, "to examine the books and accounts and methods of property accountability at the Freedmen's Hospital and report the result of its examination to the Secretary of the Interior," has the honor to state that on Friday, the 3d instant, it attended to that duty and was cordially welcomed by Dr. G. S. Palmer, surgeon in charge.

The books and papers of the hospital for several years were carefully examined, and appeared to be perfectly correct.

The committee ascertained that no money is handled at this institution. All purchases are made by the surgeon in charge, in open market, under full and free competition, at the lowest attainable rates. All stores are weighed on receipt, and properly cared for until consumed. The patients are well fed with wholesome, well-prepared food, the bread being of excellent quality.

The committee learned that the bread is not made on the premises, but flour is exchanged for bread, pound for pound. This practice should be stopped, in the opinion of the committee, and it recommends that an appropriation be asked of Congress to establish a bakery on the premises.

Invoices of all purchases are certified to by the surgeon in charge, and paid by the disbursing-clerk of the Department of the Interior. Clothing is issued on a requisition of the surgeon in charge, a considerable portion of which is made up by patients, and a strict account of it kept in a "clothing-book."

The committee sees no particular cause for recommending any alteration in the manner of keeping the books and papers of the hospital, except as to property accountability. An account of stock should be taken, and a property account kept; and the committee recommends that a board of survey be appointed to inspect and condemn certain worthless articles, such as old worn-out blankets, &c., that they be at once disposed of, and that said board of survey should meet quarterly, say on the first Monday in January, April, July, and October in each year, for said purpose.

The committee learned that no clerk is allowed the hospital by authority of law; the person employed seems to do his duties in a clerical manner, receives \$50 per month for his services, and the surgeon in charge reports him a "laborer."

The committee was shown through the various wards, offices, store-house, &c., of the hospital, by Dr. Palmer, and is unanimous in its approval of his conduct of his public trust.

Respectfully submitted.

J. E. REYNOLDS,
FRED. A. HOLDEN,
J. C. CLEMENTS,
Committee.

HON. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 13, 1873.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 14th instant, I regret to say that for several days I have made search for the paper to which your letter refers, and have so far been unable to find it. The letter was written on a sheet of small note paper, and was, as far as I can remember, unofficially handed to me by Dr. Palmer shortly before your investigation began. The letter may have been mislaid from my desk in the department, or become mingled with papers referring to other subjects.

I shall have the search continued as diligently as possible, and if the letter cannot be found I think it would not be difficult to ascertain its contents from S. M. Felton of Philadelphia, or Sister Beatrice.

I am still in hopes to find it; and, if so, shall, with the greatest pleasure, transmit it to you.

Very respectfully,

C SCHURZ, *Secretary.*

Hon. WM. B. ALLISON.

Chairman Subcommittee Investigating Freedmen's Hospital.

OFFICE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STEEL COMPANY,
No. 208 SOUTH FOURTH STREET,
Philadelphia, March 13, 1873.

RESPECTED MADAM: On April 2, 1877, I sent you \$26 to pay for the board, &c., of Mr. F. E. Felton, in your hospital during the previous month, and said in my note, inclosing the remittance, "if you think it better for him (F. E. Felton) to be in a room by himself I will pay the sum mentioned, \$30 per month."

On the next day you wrote me, acknowledging the receipt of the money, and added, "I have given Mr. Felton the room at \$30 per month; he is very grateful for your kindness to him. He finds the room much pleasanter than the ward, where he had to mingle with so many persons."

On the 16th of April, 1877, he wrote me, saying, "About a week ago Sister Beatrice removed me from the ward to a small single room, which was unheated and uncarpeted, and aggravated my disease, and charged me \$3 per week for inferior accommodations. I accordingly left the hospital to-day in search of cheaper quarters."

"My physician advises me that I shall be better off in business, as my mind would be occupied, and my lameness would not interfere with the prosecution of business if I had a good man to attend to outside matters. I have found the right kind of man in Mr. P. H. Sweeney, of this city, for thirty-five years an employé in the post-office, &c. Do you not think it would be expedient for me to take a modest office and enter into business? My physical and mental powers were never so good as at present, with the single exception of my lameness. I am more than anxious to be at work and making money. One hundred dollars would be sufficient to rent and furnish the office, which would be better expended than in paying board with nothing to show for it. I wish you would write me your views."

On April 21, 1877, I wrote you as follows, viz: "Yours of the 16th inst. would have been answered sooner but for my absence from Phil'a. Enclosed please find my check for \$15. I regret exceedingly that Mr. Frank Felton left your good care, and hope to hear that he has returned to you. He has written asking for money to establish himself in business, but I will do nothing for him in that way. I have already done so too many times, and no good has ever come of it. I have written him to this same effect. His sisters and I are very grateful to you for the care and attention you have shown him. We have not felt so easy about him for many years as we did while he was under your charge. Please take him into your hospital, if he comes to you, after he learns that he cannot take care of himself."

On May 16, 1877, I wrote you as follows, viz: "I regret exceedingly to learn that Mr. F. E. Felton is annoying you, who have done so much for him during the past year. I, of course, do not know what clothes he had when you so kindly received him in April, 1876, but I do not believe he had much of anything, for I have on file his letter of April 25, 1876, asking that clothes should be sent him at once. When he left here in February, 1876, I gave him an order for a \$30-suit of clothes, and \$180 in cash to pay his expenses to San Francisco, where his own brother then lived. The next I heard of him was through some man in Washington, early in April, putting in a claim for board; and then I learned he was taken in a helpless condition to your hospital."

I know nothing of the merits of the Freedmen's Hospital case which he is now agitating.

Regretting that he continues to annoy you, I remain, yours respectfully,

S. M. FELTON,
By BARKER.

To Sister BEATRICE,

*Providence Hospital,
Washington, D. C.*

SAINT AUGUSTINE'S CHURCH,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1878.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 19th instant has been duly received. You ask me some questions concerning the Freedmen's Hospital.

It would have been more satisfactory if you had stated the purpose of your inquiries. However, knowing you personally, and satisfied that no other motive than the welfare of the hospital has prompted them, I shall answer to them briefly but caudly.

1st. "How long have you been attending the hospital?"

Answer. For the last ten years.

2d. "Has the hospital been kept clean?"

Answer. As far as I could see, it has been. I have been there at almost any hour.

3d. "Has the food been good?"

Answer. I was there few times during usual-hours, and thought the food good.

4th. "Has any complaint been made to you by those you visited as to the treatment they received?"

Answer. None whatever, to my recollection.

I have sent many to the hospital, and they were all kindly received, for which the officers of the institution have my sincerest thanks.

Yours, respectfully,

F. BAROTTI, *Pastor.*

Mr. C. B. PURVIS, M. D.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 18, 1877.

SIR: I hereby present supplementary specifications of official malfeasance and dereliction of duty against Gideon S. Palmer, M. D., surgeon in charge of the Freedmen's hospital.

First. Hall's lecture-rooms, dissecting-rooms, and private apartments used or occupied exclusively by the Howard University Medical College, have been lighted and heated at the government expense out of appropriation to Freedmen's Hospital, in contravention of law, since the first day of July, 1876, to the present time, through the procurement or with the knowledge or sanction of said Palmer.

Secoud. Furniture, fixtures, goods, and chattels belonging to the government or purchased by it out of the appropriation to said hospital, have been placed in the halls, rooms or apartments occupied by said medical college, or the students thereof, or been used exclusively for the exercises, functions, benefit, or advantage of said college, in contravention of law, through the procurement or with the knowledge or sanction of said Palmer.

Students of the Howard University Medical College have been furnished with meals or board at the government expense, defrayed by money diverted from the annual appropriations to the Freedmen's Hospital; an exclusive table, denominated the students' table, was regularly set in an apartment of said hospital, and was furnished and equipped in a proper and attractive manuer in marked contrast to the rude style and repulsive appearance of the patients' and nurses' tables; choice meats, fish, vegetables, puddings, pies, fruits, and other delicacies were profusely supplied to the favored students, who were intruders at the hospital, and in nowise proper recipients of the government bounty; students' meals were prepared especially for them by the best cook employed at the hospital and served at fashionable hours, while the patients and hospital employes, on the contrary, were restricted to scanty and unsuitable food, odiously cooked and served, consisting, to a large extent, of bad provisions, offal, and tainted, putrid, and spoiled provisions, wholly unmerchautable, and the refuse or *débris* of the market. If said medical students paid for the meals, or board, which were provided for them at the government expense out of the hospital appropriations, it was incumbent on said Palmer to account for and dispose of the receipts in the manner provided by law, which this complainant is informed and believes was not done; if, on the other hand, said students were gratuitously furnished with such meals or board, then said Palmer has wasted, perverted, or misappropriated public property for private use without compensation, in contravention of law, whereby the government was defrauded, the hospital injured, and the patients deprived of their rights, plundered of their money, and subjected to scanty or unfit sustenance, and the comfort and conveniences which invalids require.

Fourth. Under the management of said Palmer human remains, offal, and *débris* from the dissecting-rooms of said college have been stealthily removed at night from the college-building and inhmed on the premises of said hospital in dangerous proximity to the wards, water-pipes, or cisterns that furnish the water-supply of said hospital; and, furthermore, deceased patients have been surreptitiously transported from the hospital-wards or dead-house to said dissecting-rooms to be operated on, of which corpses some were returned at night to the dead-house in a cut or mangled con-

dition, and the rest, after dissection, were preserved, in part, for skeletons or specimens, and the remains, offal, and *débris* were hidden in the hospital-grounds or some other place unfit for sepulture.

Fifth. Government property, appropriated to the use of the Freedmen's Hospital, and committed to the official custody of said Palmer, has been disposed of, to a large amount, at public or private sale, and the proceeds thereof have not been accounted for or paid over to the government by said Palmer in the manner prescribed by law.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

WASHINGTON, October 24, 1877.

SIR: I deem it right that you should be accurately informed as to my connection with the pending investigation of the official conduct of Dr. G. S. Palmer, as surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital.

Peculiar circumstances induced me to become a patient in that institution. I was not long in discovering that its management was radically corrupt, that the government was being defrauded, the patients maltreated, and the efficiency and usefulness of the hospital were seriously impaired by avarice, fraud, and speculation. A sense of duty impelled me to expose its maladministration, and with this object in view, I caused certain letters to be sent you, informing you of the abuses existing there. Subsequently, I draughted formal charges and specifications of official malfeasance and dereliction of duty against Dr. Palmer. As a matter of policy, I deemed it expedient that a colored man should appear as the complainant, and I selected Mr. Robert T. Johnson for that purpose. He copied the charges and specifications from my draught and filed them with you. I have since prepared the case against Dr. Palmer, and prosecuted it before the investigating committee. I have received no fee or reward for my services, nor do I expect or ask for any compensation whatever. I have defrayed the expenses incident to the prosecution of the matter out of my own resources, and have been actuated solely by a determination to expose a grievous wrong, and blot out a foul disgrace inflicted on the government and country.

Although Mr. Johnson is the nominal complainant, I alone am responsible for the inception and prosecution of this matter.

With great respect, your obedient servant,

FRANKLIN E. FELTON.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL, November 1, 1877.

*To the honorable committee investigating charges
against the management of the Freedmen's Hospital:*

GENTLEMEN: In reply to a request for certain information signed by Franklin E. Felton, counsel, &c., dated October 30, 1877, I have the honor to return the said request with the following reply:

First. No articles of furniture belonging to the government have been used to my knowledge, or placed in any hall, room, or apartment of the Howard University medical college building other than those leased by the government from the Howard University, except four stoves which were necessary, in accordance with the conditions and obligations of the lease, to heat the lecture-room and other rooms in use by the medical college. Stoves were substituted for steam as a matter of economy.

Second. A few trifling repairs have been made in the rooms above designated from time to time as required, in conformity to the terms of the lease of the property, but at no particular expense to the government, as they have been done by the regular employés of the hospital.

Third. No property has been leased to the said medical college, and no money has been received for rent of any property.

Fourth. Various repairs have been made as they were needed on the buildings hired of the Howard University, such as patching roofs, repairing plastering, setting glass, angling windows and doors, mending floors, painting wards, &c., and they have been done mostly by the regular employés of the hospital. Among the more important improvements and repairs which have been made, are the following: The stable belonging to the government was removed up onto land embraced in the lease of the hospital property, in June, 1876, at a cost to the government of \$40, which was paid to A. W. Collamore, house mover. In May, 1876, paid Nicholas Green for cleaning out and repairing well, \$15. In May, 1876, paid for repairing roof of wards 1, 2, 7, and 8, also

floor of engine-room, to Thomas Carter, \$18. For lumber from Wheatly Brothers, \$60.21. December, 1876, paid Pettit & Dripps for repairing steam-boiler, \$35. In May, 1877, paid for repairing coal-shed to Beverly Jackson (carpenter), \$13; to Willet & Libbey for lumber, \$47.17. In June, 1877, paid to Willet & Libbey \$57.50 for shingles to shingle storehouse. In same month paid N. B. E. Brickford for gas-governor, \$50; also paid for painting outside and in of wards 1 and 2, to J. F. James, \$44.62. For painting roof of main building, to Fenton Horad, \$10.12. Paid to J. R. Riggles, same month, for paint, \$87.03.

Fifth. The details of the slush fund are furnished in the communication of Dr. P. Glennan concerning that fund, already before the committee.

Very respectfully,

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL, November 1, 1877.

To the honorable committee investigating the charges against the Freedmen's Hospital:

GENTLEMEN: I feel it my duty to state to you that I have the best of reasons for believing that the charges against me and against the management of this hospital are the offspring of a clique of persons whose sole interest in the matter is to get possession of the offices and to control the patronage of the institution.

I have been constantly beset for more than a year, yes, for two years, by O. S. B. Wall, directly and indirectly, to induce me to purchase supplies from him, and to purchase supplies from persons recommended by him. He has insisted that I should pay him more for the articles furnished by him than I could purchase them for from other persons, and he has stated to me personally that unless I gave him 33 cents per gallon for milk, when I was making a bargain with other parties to supply the same for 30 cents per gallon, that he would make trouble for me. He has also made statements and offers to other persons, if they would persuade me to give him the patronage of the hospital. I would respectfully suggest that the committee examine Dr. C. B. Purvis on this point; also William Hoover.

Inclosed I forward to the committee a letter (copy) written by Dr. Emiel Goerner to Dr. Purvis, setting forth the interest which Dr. A. T. Augusta has manifested in these charges. I would also suggest that Dr. Purvis be examined in reference to Dr. Augusta's proposition to procure my removal from this institution.

Very respectfully, yours,

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 13, 1877.

DEAR SIR: In our conversation yesterday, you said you had heard that I was assisting certain parties antagonistic to the Freedmen's Hospital. The parties are Professor Langston, Captain Wall, and his brother, and also Dr. Augusta. They came to my house to induce me to make charges against Dr. G. S. Palmer, surgeon in charge Freedmen's Hospital, of which I know nothing. Dr. Augusta *promised* to give me the *second place* if I would make charges against the surgeon-in-charge. I replied that I was *compelled to resist any temptations*, because I had *no* charges to make and *knew of nothing* to make one of, and informed Professor Langston and Captain Wall of the fact when they made similar requests. I write you, dear Doctor, to disabuse and correct any insinuation of which you have heard to the contrary.

Dear sir, I am *poor* but I have not lost my honor.

Yours, very respectfully,

E. GOERNER, M. D.

DR. CHARLES B. PURVIS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 15, 1877.

DEAR SIR: I learn that a Mr. Robert T. Johnson, an inmate of the Freedmen's Hospital of this city, has preferred charges against Dr. Palmer, the surgeon in charge of the above-named hospital and, in fact, the entire management of the hospital. I do not know Dr. Palmer personally, but nevertheless I would like to see justice done where justice is due. I cannot speak of his hygienic system, or regulations of the elite medical profession rendered, but I can say, so far as I have learned from other inmates and their relatives, that the hospital was one of the best managed institutions

in the country. I will give the names of some of the inmates who were treated at this institution, under the charge of Dr. Palmer.

Rosenna Michells, (deceased) aunt of David Dixon, No. 1032 New Jersey avenue. I asked Rosenna if she wanted to come to my house to be cared for, when she replied that she would rather stay at this hospital because she has as good a care taken of her as she could have in anybody's house.

Mrs. Richard Hatton told me when I asked her how, and what kind of treatment did her husband get when an inmate of the Freedmen's Hospital, and up to the day of his death, when she replied, "Madame, my husband said, the day before he died, that he hoped that God would bless Dr. Palmer for the care and kind treatment that I received from him and his assistants."

This charge against Dr. Palmer is similar to the charges made against our Saviour, given up to the people by Pilate, and wearing the crown of thorns.

I am, most respectfully, yours,

MRS. ANNA O. TALBOT,
No. 1623 O Street, N. W., City.

The Hon. SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

WASHINGTON, October 18, 1877.

SIR: A patient of the Freedmen's Hospital, named Peter Dorsey, was this day summoned by the investigating committee to appear before the commission and give his testimony, which was very important, in support of the charges made by me against the surgeon in charge of that institution. He promised this morning to attend as a witness when called, but mysteriously disappeared or was spirited away, that he failed to appear when sent for by the committee. Intimidation, allurement, espionage, and treachery have been invoked to circumvent me and defeat the government in its efforts to investigate the management of a government institution. I therefore request that, in conformity to your promise to me, you shall order the expulsion of said Peter Dorsey from the Freedmen's Hospital as unworthy to receive the munificence of the government.

With great respect, I am your obedient servant,

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of Interior.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 19, 1877.

SIR: I hereby withdraw the letter I sent to you concerning Mr. Peter Dorsey of 18th instant. Mr Dorsey this day appeared before the commission and gave his testimony in an intelligent, conscientious, and honorable manner, and he also satisfactorily explained his absence when summoned as a witness yesterday. Myself and my fellow patients desire that he should remain an inmate of the hospital until he is cured.

I am, with great respect, your obedient servant,

ROBERT T. JOHNSON.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL AND ASYLUM,
Washington, D. C., October 7, 1876.

O. S. B. WALL, Esq.:

I have been comparing the prices charged by Charles Fink & Co. for groceries and supplies furnished this hospital, and I find they are very much higher than I pay for the same articles at other places. For instance, I pay for soda crackers 7 cents per pound, you charge 10 cents, a difference of 42 per cent. I pay for potatoes \$1, you charge \$1.25; difference 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I pay for cheese 15 cents per pound, you charge 20 cents; a difference of 33 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. For candles I pay 16 cents, you charge 18; a difference of 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. You see the average per centage is very large.

My directions to Dr. Glennan were to send a very large proportion of orders to you, and to continue the patronage to you so long as the quality of the goods and the prices were same as obtained at other places.

Very respectfully, &c.,

G. S. PALMER,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 25, 1877.

MY DEAR MOTHER: I am just in receipt of your very kind and affectionate letter, and am gratified beyond measure to know that you are getting better and able to travel, and will be more than happy to see you at any time and as soon as possible. I am sorry that I cannot give you such cheering news as I find in your letter as I am still confined to my bed of sickness yett, and cannot say I am better yett. I am at the Freedman Hospital in Washington, and have the best of attention as well as the best of medical attention. I have 3 of the Best Physicians to see to me, and very kind and obliging nurse, and my Friends come to see me very often and are kind to me, but yet I miss that kind, motherly attention I could receive at your hands. How is my Brother and his wife remember me kindly to them and return my kiss to Ellen. Give my respects to all enquireing freinds, and accept my Best love for yourself. Write me soon and address my letter to me at Freedman Hospital, 7th st. Washington, D. C.

I remain your affectionate son,

ALLEN BLACK.

Identified by the mother of writer as the handwriting of Allen Black.

CORNER BEALE AND MONROE STREETS,

Georgetown, August 25, 1877.

SIR: I herewith submit formal charges of official malfeasance and delinquency against Dr. Gideon S. Palmer, surgeon-in-charge, and the medical staff of the Freedmen's Hospital in the city of Washington, which charges are based on my own personal knowledge and experience as a patient in that institution or on trustworthy information derived from authentic sources. As vouchers for my veracity, respectability, and competency I refer to Hon. John A. Logan, Hon. A. H. Cragin, Hon. Hannibal Hamlin, Hon. John F. Langston, William H. Lee, esq., Georgetown, and Major A. C. Richards, all of whom are well acquainted with me.

The charges I am willing to substantiate by satisfactory evidence at such time and in such manner as you may designate.

The nurses, who would be most important witnesses in an investigation, are appointed and removed by the medical staff, and, as they would be unwilling to lose their situations, they would be intimidated from giving testimony while the present physicians are in power. Most of the patients are poor, friendless, and homeless, and they, also, would be afraid to detail their grievances, lest they should be discharged from the institution and turned adrift on the world without food or shelter. It is respectfully suggested, therefore, that the medical staff should be suspended during the investigation, should one be instituted, to the end that the full, exact, and impartial truth might be elicited as to the management of said hospital, the treatment of the patients, and the expenditures of the appropriation made to that institution.

With sentiments of respect, your obedient servant,

ROBERT S. JOHNSON.

Hon. CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

Admitted to be the draught of a proposed agreement between American Palm Pulp and Paper Company and John J. Calvert, esq., at Freedmen's Hospital.

WASHINGTON CITY,
District of Columbia:

Know all persons by these presents that I, James P. Herron, of the city and District aforesaid, am bound unto John James Calvert, of the same place, in the sum of sixteen hundred and fifty (\$1,650) dollars, for the payment of which I hereby bind myself, my heirs and assigns. Witness my hand this day of June, A. D. 1876.

The condition of the above bond is such that I, James P. Herron, have bargained and sold to the said twenty-four (24) shares of stock (\$100 each) in the American Palm Pulp and Paper Company, eight (8) shares of which fully paid up, and free from assessment by said company for any purpose, sixteen (16) of said shares of stock subject to assessment by said Co. but not to exceed fifty (50) per cent., that is fifty (50) dollars in all on each share. Said twenty-four (24) shares of stock as set forth to be delivered by said American Palm Pulp and Paper Company to the said (in two (2) certificates, one for eight (8) shares unassessable, and one for sixteen (16) shares assessable (but not to exceed fifty per cent. in all) by said company. When it is prepared to issue certificates of stock, then the aforesaid twenty-four shares shall

forthwith be conveyed as set forth. For which I hereby acknowledge, by receipt in full acceptably paid up on said stock as set forth. In which premises any failure or default on my part causing said American Palm Pulp and Paper Co. not to issue said twenty-four (24) shares of stock, eight (8) of which fully paid and free from assessment as aforesaid, then the bond herewith annexed to take effect.

Freely executed by me, in presence of witnesses, the day and date first named.

Articles of agreement made and entered into this twenty-first day of July, A. D. 1871, between Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. M. Brown, chief quartermaster Bureau R., F. and A. L. for and in behalf of the United States of the first part, and Henry Dickson and William King, of the city of Washington, D. C., doing business under the style of Dickson and King, of the second part.

This agreement witnesseth, that the said Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. M. Brown, C. Q. M., for and in behalf of the United States, and the said Dickson and King, their heirs, executors, and administrators, have covenanted and agreed and by these presents do mutually covenant and agree to and with each other, as follows, viz :

I. That the said Dickson and King shall furnish, deliver and cord up, at the Freedmen's Hospital, 7th st., beyond Boundry st., for the use of the Bureau Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, in the District of Columbia, on or before the fifteenth day of September, 1871, one hundred and fifty (150) cords of oak wood, to be well seasoned, sound, and free from small and crooked limbs. All the above oak wood to be inspected and measured as provided for by the act of Congress approved July 11th, 1870, regulating the purchase of fuel in the District of Columbia.

II. In consideration whereof, the said Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. M. Brown, chief quartermaster, for and in behalf of the United States, agrees that the said Dickson and King shall be paid upon producing the certificate of the proper inspecting-officer, as required by the act of Congress, at the rate of six $\frac{27}{100}$ (\$6.97) dollars per cord for oak wood furnished, delivered, and corded, as herein provided.

III. It is expressly understood and agreed that no member of Congress, officer, agent, or employee of the United States shall be admitted to any benefit whatsoever to arise herefrom. In witness whereof the undersigned have herenunto set their hands and seals the day and year above first written.

J. M. BROWN, [s. s.]
Bvt. Lieut. Col. & C. Q.

In presence of—
E. R. BELCHER.

HENRY DICKSON. [s. s.]
WILLIAM KING. [s. s.]

In presence of—
W. H. SQUIRES,

Witness to the signatures of Henry Dickson and William King.

Signed in quadruplicate.
Two copies duly stamped.

Memorandum of an agreement between the Howard University of the first part and G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief of the Freedmen's Hospital for the Interior Department of the United States of the second part, both of the county of Washington in the District of Columbia, whereby the said Howard University has agreed to let and does hereby let to the said party of the second part the buildings and grounds known as the Freedmen's Hospital in said county of Washington by the year, commencing on the first day of July, A. D. 1875, and ending on the thirtieth day of June, A. D. 1876, at and for the sum of four thousand (\$4,000) dollars per annum, payable monthly on the last day of each month.

And the said G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief as aforesaid, has agreed to take and does hereby take and hold the said premises as tenant as aforesaid upon the following conditions, to wit :

First. To pay to the treasurer of the said Howard University the said sum of four thousand (\$4,000) dollars rent, in monthly installments.

Second. To furnish light and heat for that portion of the main brick building necessary for, and in use of the medical department of the said university.

Third. To consent, and does hereby consent, to the reserved right and use of such portion of the said premises, as has been used by said medical department, and to furnish facilities to the professors and others, of the said medical department of the said university, for clinical instruction in connection with the said medical department.

Fourth. To put the engine in said hospital in good repair, and direct the use of

the same one hour per day (Sundays excepted) for pumping water to the main buildings of the said Howard University.

Fifth. To keep the buildings and improvements belonging to the said hospital premises in good repair.

Sixth. The Howard University reserves the rights mentioned in the above-named conditions to be performed by the said G. S. Palmer, surgeon-in-chief, as aforesaid.

In testimony whereof the parties above mentioned have hereunto set their hands and seals this seventeenth day of July, A. D. 1875.

(Signed)

J. B. JOHNSON,

Secretary and Treasurer of Howard University.

(Signed)

G. S. PALMER,

Surgeon-in-Chief Freedmen's Hospital, for the Interior Department, United States.

Witness:

(Signed) P. GLENNAN, *Executive Officer,*
To G. S. Palmer.

Witness:

(Signed) J. W. CAMP,
To J. B. Johnson.

Triplicates.

Memorandum of an agreement between the Howard University and Robert Reyburn, surgeon-in-charge of the Freedmen's Hospital for the Interior Department of the United States, both of the county of Washington, in the District of Columbia, whereby the said Howard University has agreed to let and does hereby let to the said party of the second part the buildings and grounds known as the Freedmen's Hospital, in said county of Washington, by the year, commencing on the first day of July, A. D. 1874, and ending on the 30th day of June, A. D. 1875, at and for the sum of four thousand (4,000) dollars per annum, payable monthly on the last day of each month.

And the said Robert Reyburn, surgeon-in-charge, as aforesaid, has agreed to take and does hereby take and hold the said premises as tenant as aforesaid, upon the following conditions, to wit:

First. To pay to the treasurer of the said Howard University the said sum of four thousand (4,000) dollars rent in monthly installments.

Second. To furnish light and heat for that portion of the main brick building necessary for and in use of the medical department of the said university.

Third. To consent, and does hereby consent to the reserved right and use of such portion of the said premises as has been used by said medical department, and to furnish facilities to the professors and others of the said medical department of the said university for clinical instruction in connection with the said medical department.

Fourth. To put the engine in said hospital in good repair, and direct the use of the same one hour per day (Sundays excepted) for pumping water to the main building of the said Howard University.

Fifth. To keep the buildings and improvements belonging to the said hospital premises in good repair.

Sixth. The Howard University reserves the rights mentioned in the above-named conditions to be performed by the said Robert Reyburn, surgeon, as aforesaid.

In testimony whereof the parties above mentioned have hereunto set their hands and seals this 29th day of September, A. D. 1874.

(Signed)

JOHN M. LANGSTON,

Vice-President and acting President Howard University.

(Signed)

ROBERT REYBURN, M. D.,

Surgeon in charge of Freedmen's Hospital, for the Interior Department, United States.

Witness:

(Signed) P. GLENNAN, M. D.

(Signed) J. B. JOHNSON.

(Duplicates.)

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL, October 13, 1877.

To the honorable committee, T. B. Hood, George Ewing, J. H. Walsh,
investigating charges against the Freedmen's Hospital:

GENTLEMEN: The complainant having called for a written statement, setting forth in detail the several sums of money that have accrued from each and every sale of horses, barrels, rags, hardware, iron pipe, iron scraps, swill, and all other property belonging to the Freedmen's Hospital, that have been sold or disposed of at public or private sale, or otherwise, at any time during my official term as surgeon in charge, also

to give names of purchasers, and when the money was covered into the Treasury, or what other disposition was made of the same, I hereby respond as follows:

1875, June 8.—Sold at auction, 157 pairs shoes, by Duncanson & Bros., auctioneers, and received therefor a check for.....	\$29 34
Thomas Dowling, auctioneer:	
June 15, Sold at auction, 120 pairs shoes, and received therefor a check amounting to	41 04
	70 38
Turned the amount into the Interior Department July 26, 1875.	
1875, October 26.—Sold as above, Thomas Dowling, auctioneer, 120 pairs shoes, and received check for amount of sales.....	32 96
Turned the same into the Department of the Interior October 29, 1875.	
1875, February 15.—I sold at public auction 590 pairs of shoes, and received therefor check for	106 65
And turned the same into the Department of the Interior February 21, 1876.	
1877, May 5.—Sold at auction one bay horse.....	17 00
May 12.—Sold as above, one brown horse	16 00
	33 00
Deduct commission to auctioneer.....	3 30
	29 70
Received.....	29 70
Turned the same into the Department of the Interior June 11, 1877.	

The foregoing is a detailed account of all the articles which I have sold, and the disposition which I have made of the proceeds of the sales.

I have allowed Dr. P. Glennan, the executive officer, to sell the swill, manure, old barrels, and rags, and to keep the proceeds in a slush-fund, and to pay out the same for postage-stamps, newspapers, car-fare for messengers or patients, for freight-bills, indelible ink, twine, tacks, &c., such little articles as cannot be well paid for on a voucher. I have received none of this money myself, except as I have asked him to pay for some one of the small articles. I found this custom, which is a common one in hospitals, existing here, and I allowed it to continue. Inclosed I send statement of Dr. Glennan in reference thereto.

Very respectfully,

G. S. PALMER.

Statement showing average number of patients, &c., per month, from July, 1874, to October, 1877.

Month and year.	Number.	Month and year.	Number.
1874.		1876.	
July	296	February	277
August	283	March	275
September	281	April	261
October	278	May	266
November	275	June	265
December	277	July	268
1875.		August	270
January	275	September	262
February	276	October	269
March	285	November	265
April	281	December	269
May	274	1877.	
June	269	January	279
July	264	February	280
August	269	March	293
September	248	April	285
October	248	May	270
November	246	June	275
December	264	July	270
1876.		August	255
January	274	September	246
		October	255

Statement showing amount of meat used at Freedmen's Hospital per month from July, 1874, to October, 1877, inclusive.

JULY, 1874.		Pounds.	APRIL, 1875.		Pounds.
Fresh beef	1,560		Fresh beef	1,415	
Salt beef	1,420		Salt beef	1,265	
Mutton	80		Salt pork	1,000	
			Bacon	1,200	
Total	3,060		Mutton	80	
			Ham	206	
			Total	5,166	
AUGUST, 1874.			MAY, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,700		Fresh beef	1,575	
Salt beef	1,165		Salt beef	1,200	
Bacon	900		Salt pork	1,099	
Salt pork	200		Bacon	1,100	
Mutton	100		Mutton	100	
			Ham	187½	
Total	4,065		Total	5,261½	
SEPTEMBER, 1874.			JUNE, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,540		Fresh beef	1,225	
Salt beef	1,300		Salt beef	1,200	
Bacon	2,000		Salt pork	1,311	
Salt pork	1,000		Mutton	80	
Mutton	80		Bacon	1,100	
Ham	302		Ham	236½	
Total	6,222		Total	5,152½	
OCTOBER, 1874.			JULY, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,575		Fresh beef	1,350	
Salt beef	1,305		Salt beef	1,145	
Salt pork	800		Salt pork	840	
Bacon	900		Bacon	877	
Mutton	100		Mutton	100	
			Ham	125	
Total	4,680		Total	4,437	
NOVEMBER, 1874.			AUGUST, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,305		Fresh beef	1,190	
Salt beef	1,040		Salt beef	1,070	
Salt pork	800		Salt pork	1,002	
Bacon	1,350		Bacon	600	
Mutton	80		Mutton	80	
			Ham	153	
Total	4,575		Total	4,095	
DECEMBER, 1874.			SEPTEMBER, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,440		Fresh beef	1,150	
Salt beef	1,365		Salt beef	1,045	
Salt pork	992		Salt pork	1,000	
Bacon	1,339		Bacon	600	
Mutton	80		Mutton	80	
Ham	290		Ham	95	
Total	5,506		Total	3,960	
JANUARY, 1875.			OCTOBER, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,605		Fresh beef	1,275	
Salt beef	1,160		Salt beef	985	
Salt pork	1,400		Salt pork	1,025	
Bacon	1,705		Bacon	600	
Mutton	100		Mutton	100	
Ham	240		Ham	154	
Total	6,210		Total	4,139	
FEBRUARY, 1875.			NOVEMBER, 1875.		
Fresh beef	1,380		Fresh beef	1,125	
Salt beef	1,180		Salt beef	945	
Salt pork	700		Salt pork	1,175	
Bacon	700		Bacon	612	
Mutton	80		Mutton	80	
Ham	130		Ham	138	
Total	4,170		Total	4,075	
MARCH, 1875.					
Fresh beef	1,485				
Salt beef	1,330				
Salt pork	970				
Bacon	1,240				
Mutton	80				
Total	5,105				

Statement showing amount of meat used at Freedmen's Hospital, &c.—Continued.

DECEMBER, 1875.		Pounds.	AUGUST, 1876.		Pounds.
Fresh beef	1,170		Fresh beef	1,290	
Salt beef	1,170		Salt beef	1,260	
Salt pork	1,168		Salt pork	1,408	
Bacon	600		Bacon	600	
Mutton	110		Mutton	120	
Ham	257		Ham	206	
Total	4,475		Total	4,884	
JANUARY, 1876.			SEPTEMBER, 1876.		
Fresh beef	1,470		Fresh beef	1,400	
Salt beef	1,160		Salt beef	1,100	
Salt pork	1,265		Salt pork	1,194	
Bacon	600		Bacon	600	
Mutton	125		Mutton	150	
Ham	244		Ham	187	
Total	4,864		Total	4,631	
FEBRUARY, 1876.			OCTOBER, 1876.		
Fresh beef	1,351		Fresh beef	1,450	
Salt beef	1,169		Salt beef	1,225	
Salt pork	1,204		Salt pork	1,195	
Bacon	608		Bacon	600	
Mutton	125		Mutton	120	
Ham	240		Ham	256½	
Total	4,697		Total	4,846½	
MARCH, 1876.			NOVEMBER, 1876.		
Fresh beef	1,457		Fresh beef	1,450	
Salt beef	1,296		Salt beef	1,290	
Salt pork	1,192		Salt pork	1,603	
Bacon	602		Bacon	600	
Mutton	135		Mutton	120	
Ham	212		Ham	223	
Total	4,894		Total	5,286	
APRIL, 1876.			DECEMBER, 1876.		
Fresh beef	1,535		Fresh beef	1,590	
Salt beef	1,133		Salt beef	1,200	
Salt pork	1,213		Salt pork	1,200	
Bacon	637		Bacon	600	
Mutton	155		Mutton	150	
Ham	214		Ham	339	
Total	4,887		Total	5,079	
MAY, 1876.			JANUARY, 1877.		
Fresh beef	1,445		Fresh beef	1,710	
Salt beef	1,271		Salt beef	1,510	
Salt pork	982		Salt pork	1,405	
Bacon	627		Bacon	600	
Mutton	120		Mutton	150	
Ham	193		Ham	307	
Total	4,638		Total	5,682	
JUNE, 1876.			FEBRUARY, 1877.		
Fresh beef	1,410		Fresh beef	1,737½	
Salt beef	1,250		Salt beef	1,355	
Salt pork	1,000		Salt pork	1,168	
Bacon	818		Bacon	600	
Mutton	120		Mutton	160	
Ham	219		Ham	263	
Total	4,817		Total	5,283½	
JULY, 1876.			MARCH, 1877.		
Fresh beef	1,432		Fresh beef	1,900	
Salt beef	1,092		Salt beef	1,580	
Salt pork	1,203		Salt pork	1,200	
Bacon	600		Bacon	600	
Mutton	150		Mutton	215	
Ham	135		Ham	250	
Total	4,612		Total	5,745	

Statement showing amount of meat used at Freedmen's Hospital, &c.—Continued.

APRIL, 1877.		Pounds.	JULY, 1877—Continued.		Pounds.
Fresh beef	1, 885	Mutton	200
Salt beef	1, 415	Ham	333
Salt pork	1, 200			
Bacon	600	Total	5, 343
Mutton	200			
Ham	246			
Total	5, 546			
MAY, 1877.		Pounds.	AUGUST, 1877.		Pounds.
Fresh beef	1, 960	Fresh beef	2, 220
Salt beef	1, 625	Salt beef	1, 570
Salt pork	1, 185	Salt pork	1, 200
Bacon	600	Mutton	220
Mutton	200	Ham	290
Ham	299	Total	5, 500
Total	5, 869			
JUNE, 1877.		Pounds.	SEPTEMBER, 1877.		Pounds.
Fresh beef	2, 170	Fresh beef	2, 270
Salt beef	1, 540	Salt beef	1, 390
Salt pork	997	Salt pork	968
Bacon	400	Bacon	531
Mutton	250	Mutton	280
Ham	247½	Ham	405
Total	5, 604½	Total	5, 844
JULY, 1877.		Pounds.	OCTOBER, 1877.		Pounds.
Fresh beef	2, 190	Fresh beef	2, 440
Salt beef	1, 420	Salt beef	1, 460
Salt pork	1, 200	Salt pork	800
			Bacon	405
			Mutton	235
			Ham	341
			Total	5, 681

Statement showing amount of flour used at Freedmen's Hospital per month from July, 1874, to October, 1877, inclusive.

Month and year.	Barrels.	Month and year.	Barrels.
1874.		February	41
July	43	March	40
August	41	April	41
September	43	May	42
October	45	June	42
November	47	July	42
December	47	August	42
1875.		September	41
January	48	October	45
February	45	November	46
March	48	December	44
April	46	1877.	
May	45	January	45
June	50	February	44
July	41	March	45
August	41	April	52
September	42	May	43
October	41	June	48
November	42	July	41
December	46	August	19
1876.		September	28
January	40	October	32

Statement showing amount of sugar, coffee, rice, hominy, and chickens used at Freedmen's Hospital per month from July, 1874, to October, 1877, inclusive.

	Sugar.	Coffee.	Rice.	Hominy.	Chickens.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Dozen.
1874.					
July	1,300	290	240	800	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
August	1,200	240	210	600	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
September	1,600	360	300	800	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
October	1,300	360	220	600	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
November	1,500	330	300	800	4
December	1,500	360	200	800	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1875.					
January	1,400	370	360	800	4
February	1,500	390	225	800	4
March	1,250	360	165	600	4
April	1,300	360	180	600	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
May	1,050	360	200	500	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
June	1,425	460	321	800	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
July	1,000	235	150	325	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
August	1,000	235	276	500	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
September	950	255	230	500	8
October	875	270	190	350	6
November	1,000	240	220	600	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
December	1,000	280	170	400	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
1876.					
January	1,050	290	240	600	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
February	1,050	280	230	600	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
March	1,150	270	180	600	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
April	900	270	230	600	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
May	1,150	270	90	600	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
June	1,300	360	205	800	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
July	775	180	40	200	6
August	1,150	270	200	600	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
September	1,050	270	150	474	6
October	1,075	230	130	400	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
November	1,150	230	100	400	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
December	1,150	270	80	500	7
1877.					
January	1,150	270	130	400	13
February	1,050	270	130	600	8
March	1,250	270	80	400	9
April	1,170	246	120	400	11
May	1,175	270	120	600	12
June	1,387 $\frac{1}{2}$	270	120	345	13
July	987	130	120	200	9
August	1,188	190	180	600	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
September	1,068	210	200	200	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
October	1,672	270	200	200	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
	18,448	3,846	2,150	6,539	189
	12,098	2,396	1,400	3,945	105
Average per month per capita	4.7	0.9	0.54	1.53

Statement showing amount of flour, butter, eggs, and milk used at Freedmen's Hospital during the ten months ending October, 1877.

	Flour.	Butter.	Eggs.	Milk.	Number of inmates.
	Barrels.	Pounds.	Dozen.	Gallons.	
January	45	193	75	248	279
February	44	190	90	226	280
March	45	236	150	250 $\frac{1}{2}$	293
April	53	217	150	282	285
May	43	214	90	294 $\frac{1}{2}$	270
June	47	150	110	299	275
July	41	228	140	321 $\frac{1}{2}$	219
August	19	180	120	328	227
September	28	287	180	377	218
October	32	328	190	382	227
Total	397	2,225	1,295	3,008 $\frac{1}{2}$	2,573
Pounds per barrel	196				
Total, pounds	*77,812				

* About 1 pound per capita per diem.

† About 15 ounces per capita per month.

‡ About $\frac{1}{2}$ dozen per capita per month.

§ About 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon per capita per month.

MEATS.

1877:		Lbs. Oz.
January, 656 pounds	20 6
February, 673 pounds	18 13
March, 632 pounds	19 10
April	19 2
May	21 12
June	20 6
July	24 6

	Lbs. Oz.
Of meats the quantity from January to October, 1877, inclusive, is	56, 098
Average per capita	218 4
Average per month per capita	21 13

Statement showing amount of butter, eggs, and milk used at Freedmen's Hospital per month from July, 1874, to October, 1877, inclusive.

JULY, 1874.		AUGUST, 1875.	
Butter	pounds.. 80	Butter	pounds.. 153
Eggs	dozen.. 40	Eggs	dozen.. 80
Milk	gallons.. 267½	Milk	gallons.. 219
AUGUST, 1874.		SEPTEMBER, 1875.	
Butter	pounds.. 200	Butter	pounds.. 156
Eggs	dozen.. 120	Eggs	dozen.. 150
Milk	gallons.. 268½	Milk	gallons.. 212
SEPTEMBER, 1874.		OCTOBER, 1875.	
Butter	pounds.. 190	Butter	pounds.. 152
Eggs	dozen.. 200	Eggs	dozen.. 110
Milk	gallons.. 237½	Milk	gallons.. 219½
OCTOBER, 1874.		NOVEMBER, 1875.	
Butter	pounds.. 188	Butter	pounds.. 180
Eggs	dozen.. 160	Eggs	dozen.. 115
Milk	gallons.. 251½	Milk	gallons.. 198½
NOVEMBER, 1874.		DECEMBER, 1875.	
Butter	pounds.. 218	Butter	pounds.. 171
Eggs	dozen.. 160	Eggs	dozen.. 120
Milk	gallons.. 242	Milk	gallons.. 209½
DECEMBER, 1874.		JANUARY, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 210	Butter	pounds.. 153
Eggs	dozen.. 120	Eggs	dozen.. 120
Milk	gallons.. 250	Milk	gallons.. 219
JANUARY, 1875.		FEBRUARY, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 192	Butter	pounds.. 203
Eggs	dozen.. 169	Eggs	dozen.. 180
Milk	gallons.. 250½	Milk	gallons.. 205
FEBRUARY, 1875.		MARCH, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 160	Butter	pounds.. 132
Eggs	dozen.. 120	Eggs	dozen.. 114
Milk	gallons.. 226	Milk	gallons.. 219½
MARCH, 1875.		APRIL, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 212	Butter	pounds.. 142
Eggs	dozen.. 145	Eggs	dozen.. 120
Milk	gallons.. 250	Milk	gallons.. 217
APRIL, 1875.		MAY, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 164	Butter	pounds.. 144
Eggs	dozen.. 120	Eggs	dozen.. 145
Milk	gallons.. 245	Milk	gallons.. 203½
MAY, 1875.		JUNE, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 140	Butter	pounds.. 159
Eggs	dozen.. 170	Eggs	dozen.. 120
Milk	gallons.. 243½	Milk	gallons.. 201
JUNE, 1875.		JULY, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 157	Butter	pounds.. 140
Eggs	dozen.. 120	Eggs	dozen.. 125
Milk	gallons.. 214	Milk	gallons.. 219
JULY, 1875.		AUGUST, 1876.	
Butter	pounds.. 148	Butter	pounds.. 199
Eggs	dozen.. 150	Eggs	dozen.. 185
Milk	gallons.. 219½	Milk	gallons.. 188

Statement showing amount of butter, eggs, and milk used, &c.—Continued.

SEPTEMBER, 1876.				APRIL, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	175	Butter	pounds..	217
Eggs	dozen..	160	Eggs	dozen..	150
Milk	gallons..	244½	Milk	gallons..	282
OCTOBER, 1876.				MAY, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	159	Butter	pounds..	214
Eggs	dozen..	130	Eggs	dozen..	90
Milk	gallons..	250	Milk	gallons..	294½
NOVEMBER, 1876.				JUNE, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	240	Butter	pounds..	150
Eggs	dozen..	150	Eggs	dozen..	110
Milk	gallons..	238	Milk	gallons..	290
DECEMBER, 1876.				JULY, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	159	Butter	pounds..	228
Eggs	dozen..	130	Eggs	dozen..	140
Milk	gallons..	250	Milk	gallons..	321½
JANUARY, 1877.				AUGUST, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	193	Butter	pounds..	180
Eggs	dozen..	75	Eggs	dozen..	120
Milk	gallons..	248	Milk	gallons..	328
FEBRUARY, 1877.				SEPTEMBER, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	190	Butter	pounds..	287
Eggs	dozen..	90	Eggs	dozen..	180
Milk	gallons..	226	Milk	gallons..	377
MARCH, 1877.				OCTOBER, 1877.			
Butter	pounds..	238	Butter	pounds..	328
Eggs	dozen..	150	Eggs	dozen..	190
Milk	gallons..	250½	Milk	gallons..	382

Consolidated statement of all amounts received from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the care of city patients in the Freedmen's Hospital since March 20, 1875.

Number.	Name.	From—	To—	Number of days in hospital.	Rate per diem.	Amount.	Disposition of funds.
1	Mary Dixon	Mar. 1, 1875	Apr. 1, 1875	31	\$0 50	\$15 50	} Turned in May 21, 1875 \$96 10 Turned in July 26, 1875 152 00 Turned in Oct. 29, 1875 99 60 Turned in Jan. 29, 1876 78 80 Turned in June 20, 1876 73 60 500 00
2	Alex. Clymer	Mar. 1, 1875	Apr. 1, 1875	31	50	15 50	
3	Charles Bruce	Mar. 1, 1875	Apr. 1, 1875	31	50	15 50	
4	Mary Dixon	Apr. 1, 1875	July 25, 1875	116	40	46 40	
5	Alex. Clymer	Apr. 1, 1875	Mar. 30, 1876	365	40	146 00	
6	Charles Bruce	Apr. 1, 1875	May 14, 1875	44	40	17 60	
7	Josephine Granderson	Apr. 9, 1875	Mar. 13, 1876	339	40	135 60	
8	Josephine Beckman	Apr. 23, 1875	June 30, 1875	68	40	27 20	
9	Percilla Hedgman	Apr. 24, 1875	May 15, 1875	21	40	8 40	
10	M. Peters	May 3, 1875	June 30, 1875	58	40	23 20	
11	Margaret Handley	May 12, 1875	July 27, 1875	76	40	30 40	
12	Martha Greley	Aug. 17, 1875	Aug. 30, 1875	13	40	5 20	
13	William Butler	Dec. 18, 1875	Jan. 21, 1876	34	40	13 60	
						500 10	

Consolidated statement of all amounts received from United States Marine Hospital Service for the care of seamen in Freedmen's Hospital since March 20, 1875.

Number.	Name.	From—	To—	Number of days in hospital.	Rate per diem.	Amount.	Disposition of funds.
1	Thomas McCauley	Apr. 22, 1876	May 6, 1876	15	\$1 00	\$15 00	} Turned in Oct. 25, 1876 \$38 00
2	Peter Chadwick.....	Apr. 22, 1876	Apr. 28, 1876	7	1 00	7 00	
3	Warner Daniel.....	May 10, 1876	May 25, 1876	16	1 00	16 00	
						38 00	

I certify that the above statements are correct.

Ex. M. C. S.
C. N. P.

G. S. PALMER, M. D.
Surgeon-in-Chief.

Consolidated statement of all amounts received from Maj. Gen. B. F. Butler, president of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, for the care of such soldiers in Freedmen's Hospital, since March 20, 1875.

Number.	Name.	From—	To—	Number of days in hospital.	Rate per diem.	Amount.	Disposition of funds.
1	James Fox.....	Mar. 27, 1875	Mar. 31, 1875	4	\$0 40	\$1 60	} \$10 80. Turned in July 26, 1875.
2	James Sheedy.....	May 13, 1875	June 5, 1875	23	40	9 20	
3	Thomas Gillespie.....	June 21, 1875	June 24, 1875	3	40	1 20	
4	James Cooper.....	July 10, 1875	July 12, 1875	2	40	80	} 29 40. Turned in Mar. 14, 1877.
5	Robert Nugent.....	July 21, 1875	July 22, 1875	1	40	40	
6	George Ager.....	Aug. 25, 1875	Aug. 26, 1875	1	40	40	
7	Sumner R. Tarbox.....	Dec. 15, 1875	Dec. 17, 1875	2	40	80	
8	N. B. Tomlinson.....	Dec. 22, 1875	Jan. 7, 1876	16	40	6 40	
9	James Thornton.....	Dec. 28, 1875	Dec. 29, 1875	1	40	40	
10	Edward K. Crubbin.....	Mar. 5, 1876	Mar. 8, 1876	3	40	1 20	
11	Fox.....	Mar. 5, 1876	Mar. 6, 1876	1	40	40	
12	Edward Smith.....	Aug. 30, 1876	Sept. 1, 1876	2	40	80	
13	Thomas Mannion.....	Oct. 29, 1876	Oct. 30, 1876	1	40	40	
14	William Dever.....	Oct. 30, 1876	Nov. 2, 1876	3	40	1 20	
15	William H. Wells.....	Dec. 16, 1876	Dec. 18, 1876	2	40	80	
16	John Banker.....	Dec. 20, 1876	Dec. 22, 1876	2	40	80	
17	Owen McCauley.....	Jan. 4, 1877	Jan. 20, 1877	16	40	6 40	
18	Samuel Cook.....	Jan. 11, 1877	Jan. 26, 1877	15	40	6 00	
						39 20	

I certify that the above statement is correct.

Ex. J. A. W.
M. McK.

G. S. PALMER, M. D.
Surgeon-in-Chief.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL, November 7, 1877.

To the Honorable Committee Investigating Charges against the Freedmen's Hospital :

GENTLEMEN: Inclosed please find a copy of the full-diet table, which has been substantially the guide for the diet in the mess-room of this hospital for several years. White bread, corn-bread, or crackers, is always supplied, when required, to the satisfaction of the patient.

I wish to state that the engineer estimates that 400 pounds of coal are used per day in the engine-room for all purposes, viz: for running washing-machines, heating water for laundry and kitchen, sawing wood, filling hospital tanks, and pumping water for the Howard University building one hour per day. He estimates that it requires 100

pounds of the 400 pounds used daily to pump the water up to the university. This I also judge is a fair estimate. One hundred pounds of coal per day, at the present price of coal, will amount to less than \$30 a year for the actual expense to the government of pumping water for the university, and this is a part of rent of the hospital property.

Very respectfully,

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

Full or mess-room diet-table.

Breakfast.		Dinner.		Supper.	
SUNDAY.					
	Oz.		Oz.		Oz.
Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Hash (meat and potatoes)...	6	Beef, roast.....	8	Cheese.....	2
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12	Potatoes.....	6	Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Butter.....	3	Gravy.....	2		
		Bread pudding.....	4		
MONDAY.					
Corn bread.....	8	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Hominy with.....	4	Pork.....	6	Sirup.....	2
Sirup or gravy.....	2	Beans.....	2	Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12	Potatoes.....	6		
Bacon.....	4	Bean soup.....	12		
TUESDAY.					
Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Rice.....	3	Fresh beef.....	8	Stewed fruit.....	3
Sirup.....	2	Potatoes.....	6	Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12	Beef soup.....	12		
Butter.....	3				
WEDNESDAY.					
Corn bread.....	8	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Hash (meat and potatoes)...	6	Pork.....	6	Sirup.....	2
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12	Beans.....	2	Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Butter.....	3	Potatoes.....	6		
		Bean soup.....	12		
THURSDAY.					
Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Hominy with.....	4	Corned beef.....	8	Stewed fruit.....	3
Sirup or gravy.....	2	Potatoes.....	6	Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12	Cabbage.....	8		
Bacon.....	4				
FRIDAY.					
Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Hash, codfish.....	6	Mackerel.....	6	Cheese.....	2
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12	Potatoes.....	6	Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Rice.....	3	Rice-pudding.....	4		
Butter.....	3	Tea (milk and sugar)....	13		
SATURDAY.					
Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4	Bread.....	4
Hominy.....	4	Stew (beef, potatoes, onions, flour, pepper, and salt).....	16	Sirup.....	2
Sirup or gravy.....	2			Tea (milk and sugar).....	12
Coffee (milk and sugar)....	12				
Bacon.....	4				

NOTE.—Four ounces of bread is put down in the table as a ration, but each patient who wants more gets it.

Vegetables, such as turnips, beets, tomatoes, and sweet potatoes, and fruits in the season, are always furnished in addition to the above.

Annual report upon the Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, G. S. Palmer, M. D., surgeon-in-chief.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL, Washington, October 13, 1877.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit the annual report of the Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, as follows:

The whole number of patients in hospital and asylum during the year was seven hundred and sixty-three (763), viz:

Remaining in hospital and asylum at date of last annual report	263
Admitted to hospital during the year, viz: Males colored	183
Admitted to the hospital during the year, viz: Females, colored	145
Born, males	25
Born, females	18
Whole number of colored	371
Admitted to hospital during the year, viz: Males, white	105
Admitted to hospital during the year, viz: Females	21
Born, males	1
Born, females	2
Whole number of white	129
Total number admitted to hospital	500
<hr/>	
Total number treated and supported in hospital and asylum	763
Of the above patients there were discharged cured	265
Discharged relieved	100
Died	109
Still-born	12
	486
<hr/>	
Remaining in hospital and asylum June 30, 1877	277

The Colored Orphans' Home and Asylum, containing about 115, children and attendants, has been furnished with medicines and medical attendance during the year, and subsistence has been furnished to 25 of them, who are included in the aggregate number of this hospital.

Besides the above over three thousand prescriptions have been dispensed to the poor who are constantly calling at this hospital for medical aid.

The large number of deaths in proportion to the number treated is accounted for by the character of the cases received. Some who are attacked by disease continue to labor as long as they are able, and then provide for themselves till their scanty means are exhausted, after which they come to the hospital to die; others, finding themselves affected with an incurable disease, give up all hope, cease all effort, and come to the hospital for medical aid and the comforts of a home till relieved by death.

Fifty cases of the 500 admitted to hospital were consumption, most of which necessarily prove fatal in this class of patients.

The twenty-eight and a half per cent. of still-births is readily accounted for by the fact that the mother in each case was badly diseased, or had tampered with herself in order to obtain premature relief from her offspring. Four of the 42 births were cases of twins.

The nativity of the patients admitted to hospital was as follows:

Virginia	171	Canada	2
Maryland	102	New Hampshire	2
District of Columbia	89	Massachusetts	2
Ireland	35	Scotland	2
New York	17	Indian Territory	1
Pennsylvania	15	Illinois	1
Germany	14	Indiana	1
South Carolina	5	Mississippi	1
England	5	Maine	1
Georgia	4	Kentucky	1
North Carolina	4	Florida	1
West Virginia	3	Nova Scotia	1
Ohio	3	France	1
Tennessee	3	Italy	4
Louisiana	3	Unknown	3
West Indies	3		

The diseases and conditions for which the patients were admitted were as follows, viz :

For contused wound of head	5	Ulceration rectum	3
Punctured wounds	4	Hemorrhage	1
Incised wounds	5	Stomatitis	2
Fractured skull	1	Gastritis	1
Fractured clavicle	2	Dropsy, hepatic	1
Fractured leg	1	Fistula in ano	1
Burns	2	Albuminuria	2
Gunshot wounds	2	Stricture urethra	2
Contusion	1	Orethritis	3
Frost-bite	5	Retention of urine	2
Exposure	1	Urethritis	1
Amputation	3	Cholera morbus	1
Abscess	11	Scarlatina	3
Chronic ulcer	13	Measles	1
Coxæ morbus	1	Erysipelas	8
Inflamed knee-joint	1	Varicella	1
Caries	1	Typhoid fever	4
Anthrax	1	Remittent fever	16
Gangrene	1	Intermittent fever	15
Polypus	1	Diarrhea	8
Leprosy	1	Tonsilitis	3
Amaurosis	2	Congestive chill	1
Keratitis	1	Syphilis	24
Ophthalmia	2	Gonorrhœa	5
Iritis	2	Alcoholism	7
Dyspepsia	3	Cancer	1
Hernia	1	Rheumatism	45
Psoas abscess	2	Acute bronchitis	12
Lumbar abscess	1	Emphysema	1
Scrofula	5	Chronic bronchitis	5
Phthisis pulmonalis	50	Congestion of lungs	2
Hæmoptysis	1	Pleurisy	2
Dementia	1	Ozæna	4
Apoplexy	1	Pregnancy	41
Softening of brain	2	Leucorrhœa	1
Insanity	3	Amenorrhœa	1
Epilepsy	5	Prolapsus uteri	1
Paraplegia	1	Hypertrophy	2
Hemiplegia	8	Hysteria	2
Paralysis	6	Puerperal peritonitis	1
Convulsions	1	Puerperal convulsions	2
Tetanus	1	Ovarian tumor	1
Congestion of brain	1	Endometritis	1
Trismus nascentium	2	Peritonitis	3
Neuralgia	1	Born	46
Sciatica	1	Dentition	1
Hypertrophy of heart	3	Old age	7
Dropsy, general	4	Malingering	1
Dropsy, cardiac	2	General debility	4
Asthma	1	Convalescent	11
Pneumonia	9		

The appropriation for the support of this hospital for the last fiscal year was \$45,000, and the number of days of support afforded to patients was about 98,000, which shows the daily cost of each patient for subsistence, medical attendance, and clothing to a part of them, to be less than 46 cents per day.

The necessity for the continuance of this hospital is manifest from the constantly increasing number of applications for the admission of persons suffering from accidents and wounds and from severe diseases. The location of the hospital is central and healthy. Many of the patients are non-residents, who must be provided for somewhere by the general government when they fall sick within the District.

Agreeably to instructions from the honorable Secretary of the Interior, under date of August 17, 1877, I have prepared and submit herewith an estimate of the cost of establishing a bakery on the hospital grounds, to the end that the bread may be furnished at a less price. (See inclosure marked "A.") And, as recommended in the same communication, I have asked for a "board of survey for the purpose of condemning such articles as may be of no further use."

The rent of the hospital building and grounds, which has been heretofore established at \$4,000 per annum, is limited by the terms of appropriation for the support of this hospital for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1877, to \$2,000, and the lessor, *i. e.*, the trustees of Howard University, have, through their president, addressed a communication to the honorable Secretary of the Interior on the subject, which is herewith transmitted. (See inclosure marked "B.")

The bill making appropriation for the support of this hospital for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1877, itemizes the expenditures in such a way that the usefulness of the institution is very much impaired. It appropriates specific amounts for specified purposes, which, in some instances, is too much, and in others not enough. The bill appropriates \$2,500 for medicines and medical supplies, which is 50 per cent. above the amount ever used for that purpose; but it makes no provision for payment of laundresses, watchmen, steward, house-physician, or clerk, without the employment of which the main object of the appropriation would be almost entirely defeated. It is impossible to determine in advance just what amount will be required for each separate object of expenditure.

It is respectfully recommended that the whole amount be appropriated so that it can be expended under the direction and according to the discretion of the honorable Secretary of the Interior, or under a board of visitors to be appointed by him.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

A.

Estimate of the cost of baking bread for this hospital on a basis of 350 barrels of flour per year and at the price of \$7.50 per barrel.

A barrel of flour weighs 196 pounds. It will make, according to the estimate of bakers, 246 loaves of bread weighing one pound each. If a baker takes the barrel of flour and returns 196 pound-loaves he receives \$1.52 for baking one barrel of flour, and for baking 350 barrels he receives \$532 per annum.

The cost of baking the same bread on the premises would be, for a good baker, for wages and board, \$40 per month; for fuel and other expenses, about \$8 per month more, or \$48 per month; which for a year would be \$576.

The cost of a bakery would be, as per estimate inclosed, about \$340.

Thus it appears that the present plan of baking the bread is more advantageous than baking it ourselves.

Respectfully submitted.

G. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Surgeon-in-Chief.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 7, 1877.

DR. PALMER, *in charge of Freedmen's Hospital:*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to state that I have made an estimate for a bake-house to be erected at Freedmen's Hospital, viz, a one-story building, 14 by 18; height of ceiling from floor to be 9 feet in clear; to be built of bricks, with an oven inside, to be also built of bricks, 5 by 7 in clear inside, with an iron door in front 18 by 24 inches, opening; to be one door to front and four windows, say 9 by 12=12 lights, with outside blinds; to be a good floor; walls and ceiling to be plastered and hard finish; all wood-work to be painted 3 coats of good paint, of any color; to be a tin roof, with gutters and spouts to rear of roof; to be a good box made, of good size, to mix bread, and a good strong table, made of good clear white pine; and will do all the above work and furnish all materials for the sum of three hundred and forty dollars (\$340).

Very respectfully,

G. LACOMBE.
Carpenter and Builder.

B.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1877.

DEAR SIR: As president of Howard University and representative of the important pecuniary and educational interests connected with it, I would draw your attention to the fact that the amount appropriated by the last Congress for the rent of the buildings and grounds of the Freedmen's Hospital was but \$2,000 per annum, whereas the

rent has been \$4,000 heretofore, which was a very low rate for the property, which, exclusive of the land, cost over \$100,000. The continuance of the just rent is of great importance to the University, and our treasurer has receipted at the rate appropriated by Congress only under protest, as it were, and with the purpose to seek proper relief, which we would do through you as the head of the department immediately concerned.

May I therefore be allowed respectfully to request that you will make such representation of the case to Congress as will secure the additional appropriation needed to make out the full rent?

With high respect, I have the honor to remain your obedient servant,

WM. W. PATTON,

President of Howard University.

Hon CARL SCHURZ,
Secretary of the Interior.

INVESTIGATION OF FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL.

Transcript of interview between Secretary of the Interior and Assistant Attorney-General of the United States for Interior Department on the one hand and the board or commission appointed to investigate the Freedmen's Hospital on the other.

In the office of the Secretary of the Interior.

Present—Hon. C. Schurz, Secretary; Hon. E. M. Marble, Assistant Attorney-General; R. W. C. Mitchell, secretary to the Secretary; and Dr. Hood, Dr. Ewing, Dr. Walsh, commission.

Secretary SCHURZ (to the members of the board). I have received your report, and also the testimony taken by you. I have carefully read the report, as well as every line of the testimony, together with the accompanying documents, and I have come to the conclusion that there is a good deal of variance between the one and the other. That is, it is very difficult to bring the testimony in accord with the report, and *vice versa*. In order to be thorough and sure in my judgment, I had Mr. Marble go over the report and testimony, and he came to the same conclusion I had reached. Now, I desire some explanation with regard to the matter, because I want to do exact justice in the case.

Mr. MARBLE. Let me look at the beef and flour reports. Then I would like to have a statement as to the number of patients in the hospital, to make some comparisons. (Examining the report.) I find here that the number of patients in January, 1877, was 279, and the number of barrels of flour furnished was 45; in November the number of patients was 280, and the number of barrels of flour furnished was 44; in March the number of patients was 293, and the number of barrels of flour furnished was 45; in April the number of patients was 285, and the number of barrels of flour used was 52. Did you form an estimate as to whether all that flour was used, and whether it was sufficient or more than a sufficient quantity?

Dr. HOOD. I understood we did. I think we did.

Mr. MARBLE. Given in the list running up from July, 1874, did you form an estimate as to whether that was a fair proportion of flour for the number of patients at that time?

Dr. HOOD. I understood we did. We prepared a little statement as to the quantity. We went into that estimate, and it has varied for flour, meats, and all those things.

Secretary SCHURZ. In August, 1877, the number of patients was 255, 24 less than in January; in September, 46 less. And in October and during the same months I find flour 19 in August, 28 in September, and 32 in October.

Dr. HOOD. That is explained this way: When flour was low Dr. Palmer would make contracts and take flour in excess of his actual necessities for that month. He never injudiciously purchased, or to any great extent, because he was in the fear that it would or might depreciate. And that would account for the fact that more flour appears upon his books for the month.

Dr. WALSH. There is another explanation. Prior to the 1st of July it had been the custom of the Colored Orphan Asylum to depend upon the Freedmen's Hospital. For a long time prior to July, 1877, they were furnished bread and milk. On the 1st of July Dr. Palmer peremptorily refused or declined to furnish them further with flour. It appears from that date there was a stoppage.

Solicitor MARBLE:

Question. Did you find out how much had been furnished?

Answer. The matter would probably appear in the account furnished.

Question. I don't see it in the reports.

Answer. It might not appear if it was furnished with other rations.

Dr. HOOD. It will appear in the testimony of the lady manager, Miss Hickox. I don't think, however, a stenographer was employed to take that testimony.

Mr. MARBLE. There was no such witness as that sworn; not that name.

Dr. WALSH. She was sworn, but there is no report of her testimony.

Secretary SCHURZ. The flour furnished in August was 19 barrels; the number of patients 255. The number of barrels of flour furnished in September was 23, and the number of patients 246. There is more flour and nine less patients. Then, in the month of _____ the number of barrels furnished was 32, and the number of patients 255. How is that accounted for?

Dr. HOOD. Only that when flour was low Dr. Palmer purchased in excess of his actual wants.

Solicitor MARBLE. Does it appear that he had accumulated any number of barrels of flour in the months of May, June, and July?

Dr. WOOD. I don't know that it does just in that way; but it was stated that that was the fact, I think, in the testimony of the gentleman who furnished the flour.

Solicitor MARBLE. Does it appear that flour was depreciating in those months—lower than in September?

Dr. WOOD. I don't think that inquiry was made.

Secretary SCHURZ. These explanations can hardly be correct, because the number of patients from July, 1874, until July, 1877, was about the same, numbering between 296 to 270. The number of barrels of flour during that time furnished was about the same, varying between 44 and 52. So that during that whole period there does not appear any accumulation. No accumulation has been made for the purpose of covering subsequent months. That cannot be the explanation. It is simply impossible.

Dr. WALSH. The children of the orphan asylum were furnished with bread.

Solicitor MARBLE. Doctor, does it appear that those children were borne upon the rolls of the Freedmen's Hospital?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir; they were inmates of this orphan asylum. By what authority of law they were provided for I do not know.

Dr. WALSH. Prior to July they were furnished with every article of rations and were borne upon the rolls, I think.

Secretary SCHURZ. Since July they were furnished only with bread and milk.

Dr. WALSH. No, sir; since July they were furnished with nothing, and now, remembering it, prior to that Dr. Palmer furnished them with bread and milk in lieu of everything else.

Secretary SCHURZ. According to your statement they ceased furnishing them at the expiration of the fiscal year.

Dr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. Yet in July I find 270 patients and 41 barrels of flour?

Dr. EWING. Dr. Palmer did not cease furnishing them until the latter part of July.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did you find the authority for Dr. Palmer furnishing them?

Dr. EWING. He found these people borne upon the rolls as inmates of the Freedmen's Hospital. I think they were included in the number of inmates.

Dr. HOOD. Dr. Palmer continued to issue just as he found they had been issued by his predecessors.

Solicitor MARBLE. Then, that is, the number of barrels of flour would not appear varied by the number of patients borne upon the rolls?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. The supply of flour dropped down from 44 to 19 barrels. If he continued to issue until the first of August, how does that happen, with the average number of patients at 255. If he did furnish flour and bread to the asylum, then it cannot be said any of the flour furnished for July went over to August. How is that?

Dr. EWING. The amount of bread furnished to the orphan children was not large. I think it was something like 100 loaves per day, or 100 pounds.

Secretary SCHURZ. That would be only barrel per day.

Mr. MARBLE. How many children in the asylum?

Dr. EWING. There were 105 to 110.

Mr. MARBLE. They must have consumed more bread proportionately than the patients at the hospital.

Dr. EWING. Children growing require as much as laboring men.

Secretary SCHURZ. When was the investigation commenced?

Dr. HOOD. About the flour I don't remember the day. All the flour, let me say, was baked outside of the hospital. Dr. Palmer purchased his flour always with a view to make the purchase at low rates, and the baker gave him a pound of bread for a pound of flour at that rate. As to the whole amount furnished, I find I did not make any inquiry. I freely confess to that.

Secretary SCHURZ. The number of barrels furnished is about the same from July, 1874, for each month [reading from the report]—43, 41, 43, 45, 47, 47, 48; in 1875, 48, 45, 48, 46, 50, 41, 41, 42, 40, 42, 46; in 1876, 40, 41, 40, 41, 42, 42, 43, 42, 41, 45, 46, 44;

in 1877, 45, 44, 45, 52, 43, 48, 41, 19, 28, 32, and so on. There does not appear to have been any accumulation at any time. That does not seem to account for it at all.

Dr. EWING. The orphan asylum, at the rate of 100 pounds per day, would take 15 barrels per month.

Secretary SCHURZ. If I remember correctly from the testimony, it appears that each patient was furnished a loaf per day.

Dr. HOOD. About that. There being 196 pounds of flour in a barrel, they would have used, taking the average of patients to have been about 275, they would have used one and a half barrels per day; 45 barrels per month.

Secretary SCHURZ. The average of the flour used was about 45 barrels; now as the orphan asylum is to come out of that and that got 15 barrels—

Dr. HOOD. A barrel of flour makes 240 loaves of bread.

Secretary SCHURZ. During all that time there was furnished one pound of bread for one pound of flour. That certainly does not explain it. August there were 19 barrels, September 28 barrels; falling short about 13 barrels, difference between July and September. Then in October 32 barrels were furnished. If it is true that the orphan asylum got 15 barrels per month, it is utterly impossible that the patients in the hospital received their rations.

Solicitor MARBLE. Did any proof you had show there had been any accounting between the baker and the man who furnished the flour?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir; not between them.

Solicitor MARBLE. Dr. Palmer had never called for an accounting with the baker in regard to the number of barrels of flour furnished?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir; but as between the baker and the man who furnished the flour there was none that we know of.

Solicitor MARBLE. The arrangement was a pound of bread for a pound of flour. Now, did the testimony show that Dr. Palmer had made any statement of account with the baker showing that he had received a proper amount of bread?

Dr. HOOD. It was only stated in general terms by the baker and Dr. Palmer.

Solicitor MARBLE. So you relied upon the verbal statements of the two men?

(No response.)

Solicitor MARBLE. It appears that there was an assistant engineer discharged in May, 1875, and borne upon the pay-rolls, at the rate of \$75 per month, until October, 1875; how is that accounted for?

Dr. WALSH. I remember that. I think Dr. Palmer made an affidavit to the effect that the man was borne upon the rolls only for the time employed, but the testimony was so vague it would have been impossible to fix the time when the man left. Even the testimony of the engineer in charge was not specific upon that point.

Secretary SCHURZ. The testimony varies as between the months of May and April, though it was very positive as to the year he was acting as assisting engineer for the month of May, and he was borne upon the rolls.

Dr. HOOD. It was stated that he performed the duties of chaplain for a time.

Secretary SCHURZ. I don't think there is any statement upon the part of Dr. Palmer or any body else that he did any duty.

Dr. EWING. Dr. Palmer explained that in this way: In case the principal engineer was unable to do duty, and he could not do anything, he would take his place; otherwise the whole operations of the hospital would come to a stand-still.

Secretary SCHURZ. Well, how was it after that man was discharged. Did the whole operations of the hospital come to a stand-still?

(No response.)

Solicitor MARBLE. Did Mr. Calvert, the engineer, afterward get out of health?

Dr. WALSH. The general impression was that Mr. Calvert was liable to be sick at any time.

Solicitor MARBLE. Is there any testimony to that effect?

Dr. WALSH. My impression is that there was some upon that point.

Secretary SCHURZ. There is not a word in the testimony of anything of the kind.

Dr. WALSH. You will remember Dr. Palmer only took charge of the hospital in March, 1875.

Solicitor MARBLE. Dr. Walsh, there are two witnesses who testify that this man was discharged in April or May, 1875, and from all the statements it appears the payroll was exhibited to the board, and that it shows that he was upon the rolls.

Dr. WALSH. Then in Dr. Palmer's evidence, his evidence is to the effect that he did duty equivalent to his pay, but he got rid of this man as soon as he could.

Dr. HOOD. He made a statement that he was employed as a chaplain, or something like that.

Secretary SCHURZ. There is nothing of the kind in the testimony.

Solicitor MARBLE. This written statement was read to you and incorporated in the testimony?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir.

Dr. WALSH. The testimony of Cole was to the effect that the assistant engineer

remained there until he left to go home and vote for Mr. Hayes. That would make it in 1876, and it was not until the next day that he came back to say it was in 1875.

Solicitor MARBLE. Dr. Palmer in his statement says, in regard to the chaplain and assistant engineer, "His services were merely nominal, as most of the religious exercises were conducted by volunteer preachers from without the hospital. He was discharged and an active, energetic licentiate was employed who did much better service for \$25 per month and board. During the second year two theological students were employed to perform the duties of chaplain for their board and \$15 per month. I dismissed the assistant engineer as soon as I found his services could be dispensed with. He was receiving \$25 per month and board." That is all he states about the assistant engineer.

Dr. HOOD. Dr. Palmer's statement before the board was first verbal, and he may have stated some things that do not appear in his written statement.

Secretary SCHURZ. I have read the statement that appears in the testimony. There was complaint by many patients that when they called for eggs they could not get any. Have you found that to be true?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir; we did not.

Secretary SCHURZ. Well, what did you find?

Dr. HOOD. We found that when eggs were asked for, the patients got them.

Secretary SCHURZ. To what extent?

Dr. HOOD. It is very difficult to find that except from the purchases, and the testimony of the patients themselves.

Secretary SCHURZ. As I read the testimony, it appears that only in very rare instances were these people able to get any eggs.

Dr. EWING. The number of eggs was small in per cent. to the number of inmates.

Secretary SCHURZ. I find that the quantity of eggs furnished was very large. In July, 1874, the number was 40 dozen; August, 1874, it was 120 dozen, and so on; in June, 1875, 120 dozen; in July, 150 dozen; in August, 80 dozen; in September, 150 dozen; September, 110 dozen; November, it was 115 dozen; December, 120 dozen; in January, 1876, there were 120 dozen; February, 180 dozen; March, 116 dozen; April, 120 dozen; May, 145 dozen; June, 120 dozen; July, 135 dozen; August, 185 dozen; September, 160 dozen; October, 130 dozen; November, 150 dozen; December, 130 dozen; January, 1876, 75 dozen; February, 90 dozen; March, 110 dozen; April, 150 dozen; May, 90 dozen; June, 110 dozen; July, 140 dozen; August, 120 dozen; September, 180 dozen; and in October, 190 dozen. Now, considered according to the testimony, and in view of your opinion, did it not strike you as worth while to inquire into this?

Dr. EWING. One hundred and twenty-five dozen eggs is half a dozen to each inmate during the month.

Secretary SCHURZ. Except in very rare cases they didn't get any at all?

Dr. EWING. That is undoubtedly true.

Dr. HOOD. The special diet cook stated that when eggs were prescribed by the surgeon or physician in charge, an order was issued to prepare the eggs, and that they were always at their service.

Solicitor MARBLE. That does not appear in the testimony.

Dr. HOOD. A good deal of the testimony the board took does not appear in the written testimony. We proceeded at the outset without a reporter and examined some witnesses. After that we had a reporter, and we examined some after the reporter had left.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did you not think that that matter was all-important to the testimony taken? We have a letter from the cook that bears against the management of the institution very heavily.

Dr. HOOD. The diet cook is a woman, and I remember asking her some questions.

Secretary SCHURZ. It appears from the testimony that only in very rare instances the patients were permitted to have any eggs, and I am unable to see in the testimony that that has ever been denied?

Dr. EWING. They certainly got very few eggs. The highest number set down would not supply more than eight or ten eggs to each patient.

Secretary SCHURZ. It is not pretended that each patient got eggs. They were given only in exceptional cases. All the testimony of the defense shows a large number of eggs were purchased, and also shows that a large number is entirely unaccounted for.

Dr. HOOD. A large number of eggs were used in the preparation of puddings.

Secretary SCHURZ. Well, now, here is the bill of fare, and I am unable to see that that is a fact. Sunday, for breakfast: bread, hash, coffee, butter. Dinner: roast beef, bread, potatoes, gravy, bread-pudding. Supper: bread, cheese, tea. Monday—breakfast: corn-bread, hominy, with sirup or gravy, coffee, bacon. Dinner: bread, pork, beans, potatoes, bean-soup. Supper: bread, sirup, tea. Tuesday—breakfast: bread, rice, sirup, coffee, butter. Dinner: bread, fresh beef, potatoes, beef-soup, and so on, right through the bill of fare; and Friday only, I notice, rice-pudding was given for dinner. There is certainly no accounting for the large supply of eggs upon this bill of fare.

Dr. WALSH. I never found it on a full bill of fare in a hospital; it appears only in the special bill of diet.

Secretary SCHURZ. It appears from the testimony that the number of eggs given out, or that the occasions for their use were exceedingly rare, while the supply of eggs was very considerable.

Solicitor MARBLE. You have not given any statement about the special-diet table, have you?

Dr. WALSH. I think it is there in the report. Yes, sir, that is one of the dainties, one of full diet, and one of extra diet. Dr. Hood, I think, can tell about those.

Secretary SCHURZ. It is stated, in general terms, there was a variety and a sufficient quantity of food.

Solicitor MARBLE. Your report says: "In addition an extra diet is supplied, and consists of such light articles of food and delicacies as may be directed by the attending physicians. This was found of considerable variety, well adapted to the needs and cravings of sick people, and furnished to a very large proportion of the inmates."

Secretary SCHURZ. Upon whose testimony is that statement made? It seems very positive. The testimony upon which that finding is based does not appear in the testimony you have furnished.

Dr. HOOD. Perhaps the committee overlooked it.

Secretary SCHURZ. Overwhelmingly, all the testimony is that the food was bad, and that they could not have an extra diet when they wanted it; there is very little in the report about that.

Dr. HOOD. I have understood that the committee was instructed to report outside of the testimony; we went as a board to make inquiries outside of that.

Secretary SCHURZ. The evidence for the defense appears in the latter part of the report, so that when you finished the report you had not gone all over the points.

Dr. EWING. We took nothing outside that would not confirm what was taken otherwise; none of the witnesses could point out any continuous time in which there was bad food furnished; they referred to two or three occasions during the summer the meats were bad, two or three days on two or three different occasions; the witnesses did not refer to any continuous time.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did they not testify frequently that a number of the patients were in the habit of gathering up the crumbs?

Dr. EWING. Some of them were collecting what they considered the delicacies.

Dr. WALSH. The impression was very distinct upon me that when we stopped the investigation of the food question, that if we had taken the testimony of all found it would only have confirmed what we had already taken.

Secretary SCHURZ. Have not some of the witnesses for the defense testified as to the bad food?

Dr. WALSH. There was sometimes bad meat and sour bread.

Secretary SCHURZ. Upon whose testimony did the committee rely to come to the conclusion that the food was ample, and sufficient, and good?

Dr. HOOD. Upon the testimony of the baker and the steward of the hospital, and upon the testimony of the butcher who furnished the meat, who is a man of standing, and upon the chaplain, who refused to take bad meat. Then as to the quantity, the testimony appears to be very full.

Secretary SCHURZ. You based your opinion upon the testimony given by the butcher who furnished the meat, and upon the testimony of the steward of the hospital. I find that the inmates of the hospital in their testimony go against that of the butcher who furnished the meat, and that it is so con in the testimony of the witnesses for the defense. Now, do you think the testimony of the butcher, and of the baker, and of the steward should be sufficient as against other disinterested testimony?

Dr. HOOD. I confess it was satisfactory to my mind; possibly I may have been mistaken.

Secretary SCHURZ. Now was there not testimony to the effect that bad meat was passed instead of being refused, at least in one instance?

Dr. HOOD. I think that was stated when there was a question as to whether the meat was bad or not; that is all.

Mr. MARBLE. Did you consider the meat as furnished such as sick patients should have? Such as shins, and hearts, and livers, and things of that kind?

Dr. HOOD. There were furnished, as I understand, about one pound a day of good beef to each of the inmates. I made the inquiry particularly upon that point. That meat was cooked, as I found upon inquiry, in a good way, and the meat that was passed would make boiling pieces and roasting pieces. It was composed of roasting pieces of beef and boiling pieces also.

Question. Upon whose testimony did you base that?—Answer. Upon the testimony of all the parties—the chaplain and the steward and others.

Question. Did not Chapman testify that Dr. Palmer ordered him to pass some spoiled meat?—Answer. There were some bullocks' hearts, and as to them and the tongues I have no doubt some were sent there. But nothing was charged for them. They were

not charged for. I have eaten such things in my family, and I think they were fit for the patients.

Question. You think they were fit for the patients?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Were they fed to the patients?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. How long do I understand that they made a difference between the hind and fore quarters? How long has this system been in force there?—Answer. From the time that Dr. Palmer took charge. He found that fore and hind quarters were furnished each day, and the hearts of each were furnished from day to day, including the best cuts of each, what we call tenderloin and sirloin steak.

Mr. MARBLE. If you will reflect, you found that that was only for a short time that they furnished meat by the quarter.

Dr. HOOD. If I am not mistaken I asked the man, "Did you send here to this hospital hind and fore quarters?" and he said he furnished them each day.

Mr. MARBLE. The average was quite large, you say. How was it possible that that man furnished that kind of beef and did not furnish any bad meats?

Dr. EWING. The occasion upon which the meats were bad were quite rare, and it was in the hot weather—in the summer. The meat was spoiled only during a very short time, and the occasions were during the hot weather of summer.

Mr. MARBLE. Does the testimony show when the animals were slaughtered?

Answer. The night before or the morning before the delivery.

Dr. EWING. Meat will spoil in the warm weather. That was Dr. Palmer's explanation of that. He acknowledged that it did occur twice. I do not think that any witness referred distinctly to any number of times. It occurred during the absence of ice and in the summer time.

Mr. MARBLE. The testimony here seems to show that it occurred several times.

Dr. EWING. There were no witnesses to that fact.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did you go over the testimony when you made up the verdict or report?

Dr. EWING. I never read it after it was written down.

Dr. HOOD. We took up each charge and specification and considered it.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did you go over it, and consider it, and read it?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir; no, sir.

Question. Did it occur to you that you might have forgotten a good deal after you heard it?

Dr. EWING. I formed my views as I went along.

Dr. HOOD. The report was submitted before the evidence was written out.

Secretary SCHURZ. I find that you report that the hospital was kept in cleanly condition. Upon whose testimony was that opinion based?

Dr. EWING. We went through the hospital upon several occasions.

Secretary SCHURZ. It is stated in the testimony over and over again that a certain improvement took place after the investigation commenced, and that the investigation was made in connection with matters before that time. Now, is not the testimony overwhelming to the fact that the water-closets were in a disgraceful condition, and that the cleanliness of the patients was wretchedly cared for?

Dr. EWING. Those closets were in a bad condition, and for a considerable part of the time; but that is more due to the patients than to anything else.

Dr. WALSH. I do not think there is another hospital in the country that has a lower class than the inmates here.

Mr. MARBLE. Did you base your opinion at all upon the testimony you took?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir. We made a good many inquiries as to the condition of the hospital, and what it was, during the investigation.

Mr. MARBLE. This is what you found: [Reads from report.] "It was found by personal inspection that the bath-rooms, water-closets, &c., were in as good condition as could be expected, especially when the plan of the hospital-building and character of the inmates are taken into consideration." It does not refer to a word of testimony, and yet this is what you say.

Secretary SCHURZ. It does not refer to the testimony that it was formerly very bad. The testimony as to the state of things before the investigation commenced seems to be out of consideration, and it is always without contradiction.

Dr. EWING. There was considerable contradiction.

Secretary SCHURZ. There was contradiction upon the part of the medical students, who were the beneficiaries of Dr. Palmer themselves.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you think, as you state in your report, that there was a sufficient inspection, as there should be in a hospital of that kind?

Dr. HOOD. There was hardly as much inspection as there should be.

Solicitor MARBLE. Do you consider the urinals should have remained out of repair as long as they did in the hospital?

Dr. HOOD. Perhaps not.

Dr. EWING. That was a mistake.

Solicitor MARBLE. How long did you find from the testimony they were out of order and in no condition for use?

Dr. HOOD. A considerable time.

Dr. EWING. Two weeks.

Dr. HOOD. When the engineer was sick they wanted more repairs; I don't know what. He could not make any repairs. But in my experience in the Army—during the war—I found it impossible to keep water-closets in the hospitals so that they wouldn't offend.

Secretary SCHURZ. It is always impossible to keep them in repair and to ——— the patient's the use of them?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir; it is not.

Secretary SCHURZ. Is not cleanliness most indispensable for the welfare of the inmates?

Mr. HOOD. Yes, sir.

Solicitor MARBLE. Do you consider it proper that different patients should use the same towels and basins in the same ward?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir; I don't.

Solicitor MARBLE. What did you find to be the fact?

Dr. HOOD. The testimony is conflicting. There are two classes of patients there. One, the idiotic, insane, and blind; these were furnished towels in the main, and the sick were furnished separate towels. That is, if a man was suffering from a contagious disease he was furnished with a towel for himself.

Secretary SCHURZ. There were separate basins?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. Does that appear from the testimony?

Dr. HOOD. I think so.

Secretary SCHURZ. I think it does not.

Dr. WALSH. There never was a single instance that there was a case of disease being communicated from one to another by the use of the same utensils.

Solicitor MARBLE. It was claimed there were changes every day of the towels; but when the nurse came in to testify, he said that was not so, and instead of the patients having towels, that they didn't have them, and that instead of their being changed as often as stated they were changed once a week.

Dr. HOOD. I think that is true; and we took the testimony of the nurse.

Solicitor MARBLE. That is the testimony of the nurse.

Dr. HOOD. That was contradicted.

Secretary SCHURZ. Who would be most likely to know, the nurse?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir.

Dr. EWING. A person who was familiar with the case would put less stress upon the reading of the testimony than upon the hearing.

Secretary SCHURZ. Why?

Dr. EWING. The first witnesses were the witnesses for the prosecution. We find that when Felton was present they testified altogether differently from what they otherwise did.

Secretary SCHURZ. Is there a single scintilla of evidence to the effect that there was an agreement between the witnesses as to the testimony they were to give?

Answer. No, sir; I can't say there is.

Question. Is there a single scintilla of evidence to show that they were not told to tell the truth?

Dr. HOOD. They testified one way and then the other.

Secretary SCHURZ. Why has the most important evidence, that upon which you base your verdict, been kept from me?

Dr. EWING. Several of the witnesses contradicted themselves.

Secretary SCHURZ. Why was not the question asked "you said so and so?" They were very sharply cross-examined by Mr. Riddle.

Dr. EWING. Mr. Riddle had not read the testimony at that time. We went forward upon the idea that we had enough evidence as to what construction should be put upon the evidence.

Secretary SCHURZ. You based your decision upon things outside of the testimony?

Answer. Yes, sir. I want to say to you frankly, Mr. Secretary—for the reason that we were appointed to inquire upon certain charges and to make a report based upon the testimony, and trusting our judgment as to any inquiries we should make—had I known that it was contemplated to have a reporter, and keep the questions and answers as they were given, it would have been done, but I ought to say, as a matter of fact, that we had taken two days testimony and a half before we had a reporter.

Secretary SCHURZ. In two days you could not have omitted very much?

Answer. You understood, Mr. Secretary, there was no one present except the committee.

Secretary SCHURZ. You had the same witnesses over and over again?

Answer. Yes, sir; and they seemed to show that they had been trained, and seemed to know what they had to say.

Secretary SCHURZ. Is there any evidence as to that?

Answer. None, except that they changed their evidence.

Dr. HOOD. Mr. Felton changed his testimony considerably.

Mr. MARBLE. Mr. Felton was not sworn.

Dr. HOOD. Johnson's testimony, then, was changed.

Mr. MARBLE. He was examined in the most rigid way, and the testimony he gave was unimpeached.

Dr. EWING. He is impeached by his own counsel. Johnson testified that he preferred the charges, and then Felton came forward and said that he drew them up.

Secretary SCHURZ. Here you have the evidence of Calvert—his testimony is very clear; and then Robert Johnson—that was the second time he was examined?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. Was it he that made the charges?

Answer. I don't think he did. I think it was Johnson; yes, sir, I think it was Johnson.

Mr. MARBLE. What kind of impression did the testimony of Daniel Potter make upon you?

Dr. HOOD. That he was a very much prejudiced witness.

Mr. MARBLE. Why, he was in the cook-room at that time.

Dr. HOOD. Potter was a white man.

Mr. MARBLE. Had he been a cook?

Answer. No, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did Calvert or Johnson change his testimony as to the real points in issue? Did you examine David Robinson twice?

Answer. I think not.

Secretary SCHURZ. William Brown—did you examine him first without a reporter?

Answer. Yes, sir; I think we did; I am in doubt; I think a stenographer was present.

Dr. EWING. I think he was.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did he change his testimony?

Dr. EWING. As to that precise point I don't know.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did he change his testimony as to the condition of the Freedmen's Hospital, and as to the food furnished?

Answer. I can't say what it was.

Mr. MARBLE. Did you think he was a prejudiced man?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir; it struck me that he was; by his manner it appeared to me that he was prejudiced against Dr. Palmer; he was extremely anxious to testify.

Mr. MARBLE. He was called upon as a rebutting witness?

Dr. HOOD. I don't recollect. I think he came in early in the investigation.

Mr. MARBLE. Daniel Potter says that he did not perform any duties at the hospital, except that he weighed and supplied the men with food on their plates. The question is asked—

(Mr. Marble here read from the testimony:)

“Question. It has been testified here that the butcher did not furnish beeves' jowls or cheeks to the hospital; what have you to say to this statement?”

“Answer. I say he did, during June, July, and August.

“Question. How often were they furnished?”

“Answer. Every Saturday.

“Question. How were they cooked?”

“Answer. Boiled.

“Question. To whom were they served?”

“Answer. In the mess-room.

“Question. It has been testified that the butcher did not furnish beeves' shins to the hospital; what do you say to this statement?”

“Answer. I think he furnished the joint that we call in England the shin, but perhaps may be called here the leg, however.

“Question. It has been testified that the butcher furnished fresh tongues only a few times; what have you to say to this statement?”

“Answer. The butcher furnished beeves' tongues almost every Saturday, and other parts of the week.

“Question. How were they cooked?”

“Answer. Boiled.

“Question. What was done with them?”

“Answer. Put in with the stew, and served in the dining-room.

“Question. It has been testified that the butcher furnished hearts only a few times; what have you to say to this statement?”

“Answer. He furnished beeves' hearts almost every Tuesday and Thursday.

“Question. How were they cooked?”

"Answer. Roasted with other meat.

"Question. What was done with them?

"Answer. Served in the dining-room.

"Question. What knowledge do you possess, if any, as to the anatomy of beef-animals?

"Answer. I was with my brother in the business of meat furnishing, in England.

"Question. What knowledge do you possess of the different grades of beef-animals?

"Answer. I know that there are three or four grades of meat; that that which was furnished here was of the lowest description; the meat some of it but only an inch thick, or three-fourths, on the bone.

"Question. It has been testified that all the fresh meat furnished at the hospital would make steaks or roasting-pieces; what have you to say to this statement?

"Answer. I say it would not.

"Question. What kind of meat are fresh tongues, hearts, and shins considered?

"Answer. Tongues and hearts are not considered meat; it is considered offal.

"Question. It has been testified that the salt-pork furnished the hospital has been of a quality: what do you say to this statement?

"Answer. I say it was not. The salt-pork delivered was not marketable. I have investigated the market three times, and could find it at 6½ cents of better quality than was delivered here.

"Question. It has been testified that the salt beef furnished was of good quality; what do you say to that?

"Answer. I say it was not.

"Question. It has been said that good bread has always been furnished; what have you to say to that statement?

"Answer. I say it was not; up to the time the investigation started it was generally sour.

"Question. It has been stated that mackerel that has been furnished this hospital was of good quality; what do you say to that?

"Answer. I say it was not; even the butler would take it out.

"Question. Who was the butler?

"Answer. The cook."

Dr. HOOD. I want to say, Mr. Secretary, a specimen of the meats pronounced by Mr. Potter to be stinking was shown to the committee.

Secretary SCHURZ. Who showed it to the committee?

Answer. I think it was Dr. Glennan. He brought it to the committee and showed it as a specimen of what Potter had refused to eat. It was just such quality as I use.

Question. Was there any testimony that Potter was dissatisfied?

Answer. Yes, sir; I think so.

Question. Dr. Palmer's baker and grocer, do you think they were prejudiced witnesses?

Answer. Yes, sir; I might think so. I don't think any unprejudiced party could have heard the testimony and reached any other conclusion than that the charges originated in bad feeling. It was apparent all over that that was the fact, that the charges originated and were carried on in bad feeling.

Question. Did you ever hear of any charges that originated in good feeling?

Answer. Both of the prosecuting witnesses, Felton and Johnson, showed considerable feeling. They talked about bad bread when it was proved that sour bread was brought only twice.

Secretary SCHURZ. I must call your attention to the fact that you have not based your opinion upon the testimony that you have brought before me.

Dr. HOOD. If I made such a statement I want to retract it. I don't believe Dr. Palmer was criminal at all. I want to say that the hospital, particularly the water-closet and bath-room were badly kept; it was almost impossible to keep them well.

Secretary SCHURZ. Do you believe that sufficient inspection was used to keep things in as good order as they should be?

Dr. HOOD. If I had been in charge I would have kept the hospital in better shape, that I am frank to say.

Secretary SCHURZ. You would not have permitted the water-closets to have been out of order as long as they were?

Dr. HOOD. They were certainly out of order.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you remember Nathan Street?

Dr. EWING. I don't recollect him; I think the person who wrote that testimony has made a mistake in the name.

Mr. MARBLE. This is what he testifies to (reading from the testimony): "Question. It has been testified here that the head nurse ordered you to use two basins and two towels in washing the patients' faces and hand hands, that were confined to their beds; what do you say to this?"

"Answer. That is not so, sir; no, no.

"Question. What order did he give?"

"Answer. Not any; O, no.

"Question. How many basins were you in the habit of using?"

"Answer. I am in the habit of using two now.

"Question. Formerly, how many?"

"Answer. One wash-basin, as far as my memory serves me.

"Question. Did you use one or more towels in wiping their faces?"

"Answer. Generally have two towels since I can remember.

"Question. Always the case?"

"Answer. I won't say always the case.

"Question. It has been testified here generally that it has always been the practice to change your towel every day?"

"Answer. It is not so, sir.

"Question. How long would the ward towel be in use?"

"Answer. Most generally every Friday we would make a change.

"Question. Then that is only once a week—the towel would be used for the whole ward?"

"Answer. Pretty nigh, until lately.

"Question. Within what time has that change taken place?"

"Answer. Since this committee has been going on this change has been made."

Dr. HOOD. Have you the testimony of the matron? The testimony of this woman distinctly denies that. That man—I can't recollect his name—that was in the old people's ward.

Mr. MARBLE (Reading from Nathan Street's testimony):

"Question. What is your occupation?"

"Answer. Nurse.

"Question. Where?"

"Answer. No. 1 ward in this hospital.

"Question. How long have you been a nurse in this hospital?"

"Answer. Now in the seventh year."

Mr. MARBLE. After he testified Dr. Walsh asked this question:

"Question. What was the condition of the meat that Mr. Felton threw away—good or bad?—Answer. I don't think it was very good.

"Question. It was not good meat?—Answer. It was not very good; it was tainted, close meat. Both the meat and the bacon also."

Secretary SCHURZ. Would you call the matron an interested witness?

Dr. HOOD. I think she was prejudiced against Dr. Palmer.

Dr. EWING. I think all the inmates had some prejudice.

Secretary SCHURZ. It seems that unless patients and employes testify pretty nearly upon one side they are to be taken as prejudiced witnesses.

Answer. I think that is true.

Secretary SCHURZ. Upon the other hand we find the butcher, the baker, Dr. Palmer, and a few medical students; and upon that testimony you based your decision entirely favorable to the hospital.

Dr. HOOD. Not wholly.

Secretary SCHURZ. It is rather a compliment to Dr. Palmer for the efforts he has made to reform the hospital. That is about it, isn't it?

Dr. WALSH. I went there prejudiced very much against Dr. Palmer on account of certain affairs. In less than a week, when I took the testimony into consideration, I came to the conclusion that he was conducting the hospital well.

Secretary SCHURZ. What testimony did you consider?

Answer. The testimony of the patients and the inmates in the wards as to the manner in which they were treated.

Secretary SCHURZ. The testimony that appears there does not bear that out.

Dr. WALSH. We moved among those patients, and it certainly struck us so.

Secretary SCHURZ. That is outside of the evidence.

Dr. WALSH. The matter of Wallace, where Dr. Purvis said "I will give you these pieces of plank"—he said it had never happened; and a number of other things changed my mind.

Dr. HOOD. I distinctly understand that you wanted the opinion of your committee as well as the evidence. I did not contemplate that we were to make any such inquiry. We based that report upon certain things that do not appear in the testimony.

Secretary SCHURZ. Well, I find your opinion differs very materially from the impression produced by the evidence. Did you find any warrant in law for the feeding of medical students from Howard University? Tell me that.

Dr. HOOD. No, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did you not consider that act so directing a part of the appropriation made to the support of the hospital—

Dr. HOOD. We found young men who were called resident students. We found that Dr. Palmer, when he took charge of the hospital simply continued them. We made inquiry as to the authority, and we found they were employed about the hospital as

nurses, and all that kind of thing, and we came to the conclusion, after considering it, that there was no warrant of law.

Secretary SCHURZ. We can find no law regulating the Freedmen's Hospital; we find only the appropriation bill.

Mr. MARBLE. Did you not find there were two wards left with only one nurse in charge?

Dr. HOOD. That was sometimes the case. That was before Dr. Palmer went there.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you consider that was caring for the patients?

Dr. HOOD. Many of these people remained there for months and months—they are people who take care of themselves. These men did not require nurses at night. We made up our minds that as many nurses had been furnished as the condition of the appropriations would allow, considering all the difficulties.

Dr. EWING. Dr. Palmer is paying more nurses now than the appropriations allow—so many nurses are specified in the appropriation. There is a specified amount for nurses, and he finds it is not enough. In each of these wards there should be night-nurses, but I don't think Dr. Palmer has appropriations enough to carry on a first-class hospital.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you think he should call upon patients to carry out dead bodies?

Dr. EWING. If a patient objected, I don't think he should be called upon.

Mr. MARBLE. Would it be beneficial to that man's recovery?

Dr. EWING. It would not be backward to his recovery.

Dr. HOOD. It would not hurt Johnson in the least.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you make any suggestions to the Secretary as to this year, or any recommendations upon which he can base other recommendations, or anything in regard to changes in the hospital?

Dr. HOOD. That is not in—

Mr. MARBLE. Would the Secretary get any idea that there is an insufficiency of help in the hospital?

Dr. HOOD. I thought they didn't have enough. I didn't consider that question germane to the inquiry. I think if we had, that we would have traveled outside of the matter of our inquiry.

Dr. EWING. Our inquiry was, Is this hospital carried on as it should be?

Secretary SCHURZ. And your opinion is that it is?

Dr. EWING. It is not a first-class hospital at all. Dr. Palmer has, I think, at times, had more persons there than there should be.

Mr. MARBLE. Did you find him keeping any regular set of books and accounts?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir, we did; every paper was carefully filed away.

Secretary SCHURZ. You state that as to the amount of flour furnished to the baker, and the amount of bread furnished by the baker, the only thing you saw was the statement that Dr. Palmer received a pound of bread for a pound of flour; did you find anything showing the accounts governing such transactions? Did you find any books upon that question?

Dr. HOOD. Chapman testified to his receipting for so many loaves of bread each day.

Secretary SCHURZ. Did he give the figures?

Dr. HOOD. I don't think he did. The inquiry was made in such a way as to satisfy me that it was all right.

Secretary SCHURZ. If satisfied with the statement that "it is all right," it is very easy, then, to come to the conclusion you have.

Dr. EWING. I didn't feel that we should go any further in this matter, because that matter had been examined by a committee a short time before.

Mr. MARBLE. There was a charge of misappropriations of funds, and the natural inquiry would be and was: What account was given of the funds; what books were kept, and what checks were used in that connection? The surgeon-in-chief had to look after all the expenditures, and he ought to know from day to day as to the appropriations; where they were going to, and what they were going for.

Dr. HOOD. I think he has those books.

Mr. MARBLE. Have you examined those books as to their bearing upon his business qualifications?

Dr. WALSH. We had furnished to us his accounts and his pay-rolls for each month, and vouchers for every dollar that he paid out; all the papers were filed month by month; we had them all and looked into them.

Mr. MARBLE. Was there any account kept by his steward as to the amount of bread and the amount of meat?

Dr. HOOD. The steward kept a book showing so many pounds of bread and so many pounds of meat.

Mr. MARBLE. Did you prove that person's accounts by the baker's books?

Dr. HOOD. It would take a great length of time to have done that.

Mr. MARBLE. You were not required to find a verdict within a specified time?

Secretary SCHURZ. I had several private talks with Drs. Hood and Ewing, in which

I said I wanted to get at the bottom of these things, and the matter of time did not come up.

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir, that is correct. As to the accounts, it occurred to me that vouchers would be had here from the officer who pays these accounts; I heard it could be done much more satisfactorily.

Secretary SCHURZ. The question is, whether the hospital received what it was charged with having received upon the vouchers? Do they show that receipt—the material upon which the voucher was paid and for which it was paid? I have no doubt the hospital was the proper place to inquire into this. There is a charge that funds have been misused. Take the article of bread, or meat, or of eggs; what is there to show that no funds have been misused? Is there anything in the testimony?

Dr. HOOD. As to the eggs, we passed through the wards and questioned the patients. We would question them like this: "How long have you been here?" "How many months?" &c. "Have you been applying to get eggs?" "If you have, have they been denied to you?" "What have you had?" &c., and, I think, at all times they got what they called for excepting a few things upon the special-diet list.

Secretary SCHURZ. How does it happen that the defense didn't call a single person to testify as to these things?

Mr. MARBLE. Are there many dangerous men in the hospital?

Dr. HOOD. O, no, sir.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you remember the testimony of Owen Chase as to Tom Johnson?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir; he is an idiot, about as harmless as any animal could be. He might get angry and strike a heavy blow.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you remember the testimony about his treatment of the boys and the women?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARBLE. Do you consider he was a proper man to be around—to be running around loose?

Dr. HOOD. It would be better not to have him there; he ought to be confined in a cell.

Mr. MARBLE. It has been going on for years. Was it good management to allow such creatures as that to run loose about the hospital?

Dr. HOOD. There is no testimony that he ever reached the women. He is certainly not a very nice companion for the boys.

Mr. MARBLE. And the testimony shows that he waylaid these boys and got into their beds at night.

Dr. WALSH. He attempted something of that kind.

Mr. MARBLE. If he was the powerful beast he is reported to be, he could do some considerable harm.

Dr. HOOD. He is not so terrible, but he has no business there.

Dr. EWING. He is a relic of the old Freedmen's Bureau.

Secretary SCHURZ. Do you think, under the appropriation as it now is, sufficient care has been used to make that hospital what it might be?

Dr. EWING. That was my impression; that that hospital is as well conducted as the amount of funds at the disposal of Dr. Palmer can make it.

Secretary SCHURZ. Would it require any large amount of funds to institute a sufficiently strict system of inspection?

Dr. EWING. Nothing could be done without further expenditure.

Secretary SCHURZ. Don't you think the lack of inspection was the cause of many of the complaints made?

Dr. EWING. The inspection would obviate some of the complaints.

Secretary SCHURZ. Is not a system of inspection one of the most essential proofs of good management?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir; I think so.

Secretary SCHURZ. Might not that hospital have been kept more cleanly without further expense?

Dr. HOOD. The evidence was rather to the contrary upon that. The nurses all testified that they have done as well as they could.

Secretary SCHURZ. As to the food; the butcher swears as to the money he received he did furnish as good as he could. Should not the meat have been good?

Dr. EWING. Yes, sir; and I think the testimony is that, with few exceptions, the meat was good.

Dr. HOOD. The food is, as I believe—the meats were good merchantable meats; they were not such meats as can be bought for 25 cents per pound; and, as to the prices, I think there can be no exception taken.

Secretary SCHURZ. They would furnish a large amount of meat—a whole side at once; now, when they furnished meat in that way, they should get just as good as you or I get?

Dr. HOOD. No, sir; there are poor bullocks and good bullocks; you will find one class of cattle where they charge more than for another. Some butchers sell finer meat

than others. There is great distinction in this respect. Look at the question of fancy butter; you can get good butter at 35 cents, and other butter at \$1 per pound.

Secretary SCHURZ. At the prices paid should he not have furnished a good quality of beef, where they furnished a whole side?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir.

Secretary SCHURZ. Would you call lean beef or lean beeves good quality?

Dr. HOOD. There are different qualities.

Secretary SCHURZ. What price was paid for the beef?

Dr. HOOD. Eight cents; and from the testimony produced I got it into my head that the butcher never furnished anything but the fore-quarter beef; it is much cheaper than the hind-quarter.

Mr. MARBLE. Hoover didn't furnish any quarters except latterly.

Secretary SCHURZ. And then it depended upon what part of the quarter he furnished?

Dr. HOOD. Yes, sir; to a certain extent.

INDEX.

	Page.
Agreement for furnishing wood to hospital	314
Agreement with American Palm Pulp and Paper Company, Draught of	313
Atkins, Mary, Testimony of	119
Augusta, Dr. A. T., Testimony of	221
Auth, Santus, Testimony of	150
Baer, Henry, Testimony of	39
Bagley, Mary, Testimony of	127
Banes, Rodman, Testimony of	235
Banks, Charles, Testimony of	66
Banks, Mary Ann, Testimony of	114
Barotti, Rev. Felix, Testimony of	180
Barotti, Rev. Felix, Letter of	309
Bell, Alonzo, Testimony of	265
Borland, Betsey, Testimony of	125
Boylan, Michael, Testimony of	36
Bresnahan, John, Testimony of	38
Brown, William, Testimony of	76, 174
Calvert, John J., Testimony of	99, 294
Carroll, Frank, Testimony of	193
Carson, Perry H., Testimony of	169
Cavis, Adam T., Testimony of	248
Chapman, George, Testimony of	128, 240
Chase, Owen, Testimony of	90
Clary, Wilbert, Testimony of	151
Committee, investigating, Report of, to Interior Department	254
Committee to examine hospital books, &c., Report of	307
Cook, John H., Testimony of	244
Cooper, Annie, Testimony of	127
Crusor, Collins, Testimony of	167, 238
Dawes, Susan, Testimony of	126
Delany, Robert, Testimony of	98
De Mott, William, Testimony of	161
Dix, William, Testimony of	160
Dolley, George, Testimony of	184
Duffy, Sister Beatrice, Testimony of	164, 165
Fanteroy, John, Testimony of	133
Felton, Franklin E., Testimony of	51, 194
Felton, Franklin E., Letters of	62, 310
Felton, S. M., Letter of	307
Fifield, J. N., Testimony of	250
Glennan, Dr. P., Testimony of	24, 166, 282
Good, Joseph, Testimony of	37
Goerner, Dr. E., Letter of	311
Gray, George, Testimony of	137, 241
Gray, Lizzie, Testimony of	135
Gusthoff, Augustus, Testimony of	265
Gusthoff, Mrs. Augustus, Testimony of	264
Hamilton, John A., Testimony of	157
Harcoub, Lucius, Testimony of	82
Hartuett, Richard, Testimony of	149
Heacock, Eliza	176
Herron, James P., Testimony of	142
Hood, Dr. Thomas B., Testimony of	253
Hoover, William H., Testimony of	146, 241
Hurd, James, Testimony of	122
Interview between Secretary Schurz and investigating board	328
Johnson, James, Testimony of	65
Johnson, J. B., Testimony of	68, 163
Johnson, J. B., Letter of	69
Johnson, Robert T., Charges by	28, 29
Johnson, Robert T., Charges supplementary by	310
Johnson, Robert T., Letters of	312, 313

	Page.
Johnson, Robert T., Testimony of	10, 296
Jones, Thomas, Testimony of	263
Kaiser, Henry, Testimony of	153
Keene, Dr. P. T., Testimony of	64
Lamb, Dr. Daniel S., Testimony of	248
Lawson, Betsey, Testimony of	124
Leases, Hospital building	314, 315
Leonard, James, Testimony of	170
Letter of Secretary Schurz as to a missing paper	308
Letter of S. M. Felton	308
Letter of Rev. F. Barotti	309
Letter of J. B. Johnson	69
Letters of Robert T. Johnson	312, 313
Letters of Franklin E. Felton	62, 310
Letter of Dr. E. Goerner	311
Letter of Daniel Potter	70
Letter of Mrs. A. O. Talbot	311
Letter of Dr. G. S. Palmer	32, 213, 312
Lucas, Wesley, Testimony of	95
Marshall, Richard, Testimony of	170
Mayer, Theodore J., Testimony of	155
Maxwell, Arthur, Testimony of	193
McDevitt, James A., Testimony of	171
McFarland, Sidney, Testimony of	231
McGraw, James F., Testimony of	251
McPherson, Dr. D. N., Testimony of	187
Palmer, Dr. G. S., Testimony of	1, 26, 139, 143, 164, 233
Palmer, Dr. G. S., Reply to charges	30, 310, 311
Palmer, Dr. G. S., Letters of	32, 213, 312
Palmer, Dr. G. S., Statements by	315, 316, 318, 319, 321, 322
Palmer, Dr. G. S., Report of, for fiscal year 1877	325
Parsons, Dr. Mary A., Testimony of	177
Patterson, Dr. D. C., Testimony of	62
Paton, Rev. William W., Testimony of	34
Peters, Charles H., Testimony of	242
Potter, Daniel, Testimony of	70
Potter, Daniel, Letter of	70
Powell, Anna M., Testimony of	137
Purvis, Dr. C. B., Testimony of	16, 145, 206
Rabbitt, John T., Testimony of	246
Rallete, Charles, Testimony of	36
Redway, H. K., Testimony of	251
Reed, Daniel, Testimony of	98
Report of investigating committee to Interior Department	254
Report of committee to examine hospital books, &c	307
Report of Dr. Palmer for fiscal year 1877	325
Reyburn, Dr. Robert, Testimony of	187, 280
Rooy, Charles A., Testimony of	171
Sanders, Henry, Testimony of	116
Sheeby, Patrick H., Testimony of	145
Shoner, James F., Testimony of	185
Smith, Harriet, Testimony of	126
Spackman, Dr. Mary D., Testimony of	178
Stagg, S. F., Testimony of	68, 186
Stewart, Samuel, Testimony of	82
Street, Nathan	126
Syphax, William	182
Table, Full diet, hospital	324
Talbot, Mrs. A. O., Letter of	311
Vernon, Charles R., Testimony of	169
Wall, Albert G., Testimony of	189
Wall, O. S. B., Testimony of	210, 302
Walsh, Dr. R. S., Testimony of	184
West, William H., Testimony of	168, 252
Williamson, William, Testimony of	38
Witner, Calvin, Testimony of	159
Wolf, William, Testimony of	148

★ ★ ARMY ★ ★
MEDICAL LIBRARY

Cleveland Branch

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 05227110 2