

inct and separate from the prison itself—a construction which would occasion the extraordinary anomaly of denying to the Directors a privilege expressly permitted, in the same house, to the Keeper. It was in this room of the Directors that a sideboard had been kept for many years, which Dr. Baxley undertook to reform, and in which reformation he requested the co operation of John G. Proud, one of his colleagues, that he alleges was declined. It is within the knowledge of both the members of the Executive Committee, and the Warden, that Mr. Proud did not decline a co-operation in the removal of the sideboard; he did, however, from a proper respect to the other members, decline a co-operation in its removal without consultation with, and consent of, the Board of Directors, but he offered to second and vote for such a proposition, if made at the Board. It is also within the knowledge of the same persons, that the motive assigned by Dr. Baxley at the time for breaking up the sideboard was, to remove a temptation from the then Clerk of the Institution, in which they and some other Directors cordially concurred, but which gave offence to the Clerk and one of the Directors, who has since become associated with Dr. Baxley in his complaints against a majority of the Board.— So much for the sideboard, which forms so serious an item in the accusations that have been made.

In his answer to the 21st interrogatory, Dr. Baxley alleges, that a proposition to improve the Hospital Department “was agreed to by the Board, and an appopriation made for the purpose, but the Committee entrusted ‘with the execution of the duty, and consisting of J. G. Proud and Wm. H. Hanson,’ have failed to discharge it.”— The simple facts in this case are, that the Committee entrusted with that duty consisted of J. G. Proud, *H. Willis Baxley*, A. White and Thomas Kelso; and Mr. Hanson was *not* upon it, as the minutes of the Board will show. At that time, the Building Committee consisted of J. G. Proud, *H. Willis Baxley*, and A. White. So that, in respect to either Committee, if there was any neglect of duty in the matter, Dr. H. Willis Baxley is as liable to the charge as either of the other members. But the fact is, the expenditures on the new work-shops required, not only all the funds that could be spared from other essential purposes of the Institution, but also, as a work of absorbing importance, all the labor that could be brought to bear upon them; and Dr. Baxley knows full well, not only that he himself coincided in the necessity of the delay, but that the Board of Directors, being acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, were perfectly satisfied that the necessity was uncontrollable. A radical improvement of the Hospital has been distinctly recommended by the Directors—not merely a slight convenience in the mode of access to it, but one requiring funds beyond the ability of the Institution to provide.

In his reply to the 24th interrogatory, Dr. Baxley intimates his former charge, that the Executive Committee receive a greater compensation than the law allows. To this, the answer may be very