

APPENDIX

LORD SEYMOUR'S SPEECHES, 6 JULY AND 31 JULY 1854
(pp. 360-1, 365-7 above)

CHADWICK drew up a number of memoranda rebutting Seymour's allegations point by point. A few examples will serve to illustrate Seymour's standards of controversy.

Seymour: "He had himself visited a town immediately after a Report of that kind [*sc.* a local report by an Engineering Inspector] had been sent in, and having taken the Report in his hand and tested by personal examination the statements which were made in it, he had no hesitation in declaring that a more exaggerated Report he had never read."¹

Chadwick: "On this representation it is proper to state that Lord Seymour never communicated anything of the kind in his place at the Board, to enable them to make inquiry into the facts, or to enable the particular inspector to adduce anything he may have to shew in his justification. The Board submit that it is a grievous abuse after an opportunity has been possessed of making them where they might have been properly investigated to make such statements where the parties accused have no power of answering. Although reports upon examinations of towns are locally published; and subjected generally to local scrutiny and opposition they are unaware of any instance, where before select committees of the House or otherwise any such charge as that made by Lord Seymour has been substantiated."

Seymour: "All the ordinary feelings of mankind were to be set aside, all the tender emotions of relations to be trampled upon, all the decency of mourning, all the sanctity of grief to be superseded, in order that the Board of Health might get their funeral fee."²

¹ *Hansard*, vol. cxxxiv, p. 1299, 6 July 1854.

² *Ibid.*, vol. cxxxv, p. 982, 31 July 1854.

Chadwick: "Now if ever there was an official investigation in which the ordinary feelings of mankind previously overlooked the decency of mourning and the sanctity of grief were considered, it will be acknowledged on the examination of the reports on the subject by impartial persons to be the Metropolitan scheme of extramural sepulture.

"A great living writer speaks of that report emphatically as an honour to humanity. The measure by which Lord Seymour superseded it was one which after the feelings of mankind and the peculiar sufferings of the poor had been displayed and provided for sets them aside scornfully and tramples upon them. . . ."

Seymour: Sir George Grey had requested him to put the Interments Act into operation without delay; he had therefore remained in town that autumn to carry out his right honourable Friend's wishes.¹

Chadwick: "Now the whole of this is at variance with the truth. He declared at the first and at all times that he could not attend; he moreover avowed to the Members of the Board that his rule was never to act until he was obliged, and then to do as little as he could. He acted in accordance with this declaration, and not in accordance with his promise to Sir George Grey to expedite the matter; he did not attend the deliberations of the Board, he made no offer to take part in them, though it was his right as well as his duty to do so."

Seymour: "After Dr. Smith had been a fortnight in office, he went to the Board to hear what they proposed and were prepared to do. He asked them, 'Well, gentlemen, have you got into order? and if so, what are you going to do? Have you made up your minds as to what shall be your first step?' 'Oh, yes,' said these gentlemen, 'we have made up our minds what we shall do.' 'What is that?' 'Well, we're going to Paris' . . . and the Board accordingly went to Paris, taking their secretary with them to write their letters and pay their bills."²

Chadwick: "It was not the first step of the Board, and he was never told that it was the first step. The first steps were taken immediately the Royal assent was given, and they are stated in

¹ *Hansard*, vol. cxxxv, p. 985.

² *Ibid.*, p. 986.

page 1 of the printed Minutes laid before Parliament. Whilst the large measures therein recited, and in other Minutes from the 5th of August to the 4th of September were in progress, it was requisite to make other preparations for the work in hand.

"... To collect information upon which to lay down a plan in outline for legislation is one thing; to get information to fill up the plan in detail for subsequent practical execution is another and even more important step. . . . The Board considered it necessary that they as well as their chief officers, who were charged with the executive measures should see with their own eyes the practical working of a change of system which had been in operation for a number of years in the largest capital in Europe, and they had moreover important questions to determine which they considered might be the most economically determined on the spot. . . ."

Seymour: He had objected to the employment of Paxton and Dr. Braun.¹

Chadwick: The Board had thought of seeking Paxton's advice on the vegetation and layout of their National Cemetery; and had consulted Dr. Braun in order to avoid those violations of taste in monumental decoration which made some burial grounds 'mere stone quarries.' "This recourse to the highest available talent is sneered at by Lord Seymour who speaks as if the subject in hand were common churchyards, as if moreover in his view they required no special care."

Seymour: "He had attended the Board on 30 January 1851, and proposed that they should adopt the Treasury's plan for bringing the Interments Act into operation. The Board resisted his suggestion and told him that his proposal was not seconded."²

Chadwick: "This statement is so couched as to imply a misrepresentation to the house; namely, that the Board were about to proceed with the execution of a new scheme new and unauthorised by the Government, and unsanctioned by Parliament, whereas the grounds for their measure had been submitted with all the evidence to the Government and to the public. . . . In the Act provision was made for the purchase of the whole of the trading

¹ *Hansard*, vol. cxxxv, p. 986.

² *Ibid.*, p. 987.

cemeteries. The duty which remained to be performed was to comply with the provisions of the statute. . . . The course which his Lordship thought fit to take whether at the instance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer or upon his own suggestion was against the known intent of the statute. On the grounds stated in the letter to the Treasury . . . the plan proposed by Lord Seymour was absurd in itself and on the consideration of those grounds was rejected by the Treasury who after several months of time [and] money had been lost and evil had been protracted by Lord Seymour's opposition agreed to the Board proceeding with the measure according to their original report. . . ."

Seymour: "Lord Shaftesbury, speaking upon his honour, spoke, it was to be remembered, upon the information of the secretary—not having been himself present on the occasion—whereas he [Lord Seymour] having been present, spoke from his own recollection."¹

Chadwick: "We declare most solemnly that we were present at a Board held on the 30th of January 1851 the day on which it is recorded in the Minutes that Lord Seymour attended and made a motion that was not seconded, and we further declare that Lord Shaftesbury was present and made the proposition which was adopted. On our remembrance being called early to Lord Seymour's allegation, that he had been *told* that his motion had not been seconded, we declare that he was not so told by us or by Lord Shaftesbury in our presence on that occasion, nor do we believe that he was so told on any other occasion whatsoever.

"On no occasion did it happen to Mr. Chadwick or Dr. Southwood Smith to move to set aside any propositions made by Lord Seymour. They on all occasions endeavoured to treat him with the respect due to his office and position, whilst they had to pass over gratuitously offensive behaviour on his part towards themselves which in one instance Lord Shaftesbury considered ought not to be passed over, and made it the subject of a remonstrant correspondence and resolution."

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 987.